Social Entrepreneurs as Carriers of Intention

Contrasting notions of

bounded and entwined sociality

in a domain of social change

Andreas Silva

Stockholm
University

Disclaimer of anonymity

Names of organisations, individuals and places have all been modified to protect the anonymity of those involved, but also to underline the purpose of this thesis to engage with particularities of organisational and social life, thus not being a study *of* an organisation but an exploration *through* it.

Content

Abstract

Contributing to the area of organisational anthropology, this research is an engagement with a Swedish non-profit organisation navigating a domain of social entrepreneurship, an area in the intersection between state, market and civil society, populated by organisations and people explicitly working with a social aim. Following the organisational practices of protecting, applying and advancing an intention for social change, this research explores how such an intention is negotiated and navigated with others in that domain, how it's manifested in the everydayness of work, and how it's sustained in the encounter with uncertainty and indeterminacy. By contrasting notions of bounded and entwined sociality – sociality as an exchange across boundaries or as an entanglement of lines – it defies compartmentalised notions of how organisational relationships are made and unmade, sustained and dissolved. Exploring how relational proximities and distances can be seen to be made, suggesting that the notion of entwined sociality allows for a far more complex understanding than that of bounded sociality, it contributes to a diverse, vulnerable, and ambiguous knowledge-making of organisational life, and of life in general. Approaching social entrepreneurs by their own motion in the world, rather than by predefined frames and definitions, it suggests the concept of carriership of intention, as a way to conceive a practice-oriented notion of the organisational particularities and transformational imaginaries weaved into efforts for social change. Relying on a two month period of almost daily participant observation, it also adds to a limited but slowly expanding body of ethnographic research on social entrepreneurship.

Keywords: Carriership of intention; Social entrepreneurship; Entwined sociality; Social change; Organisational anthropology; Tim Ingold.

Introduction

Prelude

Roya and Olivia, the two co-founders of the non-profit organisation Swedes Included, are having a scenarios workshop. A few days before, they realised they needed to deepen and synchronise their understanding of some challenges they have ahead. As it seems, they're going to have to let go of one of their six project leaders, due to a decrease in demand of their services from some of their partners, and thus a decrease in funds. In accordance with contemporary Swedish labour laws, where the last one to be hired is the first one to go, the project leader they will have to let go of is Vera. It's their first proper layoff. And it's their friend.

They're also in the final stages of hiring an externally recruited CEO, a change they've discussed for years and finally are implementing. They haven't shared the news about the potential exit of Vera with the rest of the team yet. And although the process of hiring a CEO has been known to all for a long time, the value and necessity that Roya and Olivia see in it does not seem to have caught on with the team as a whole. In a few days Roya and Olivia will be having a meeting with them, to share the dire financial situation, the probable layoff, and to continue helping them better understand the reasons that Roya and Olivia see for hiring a CEO.

"How are we going to talk to Vera about this", Olivia says. They reflect on how to balance private life and work life in relation to the team, asking themselves if they, as the management, should socialise privately with the personnel or not. "But it's hard", Olivia says and turns to me, "most of us are really friends with each other. Some of us go back way before Swedes Included even existed".

The exploration of scenarios is not due to hesitation, Roya and Olivia know what they need to do and what they think is best, given the circumstances – to hire Christer, the CEO candidate they've spent the last few months evaluating, and to let Vera, the project leader, go.

They decide to sketch three different scenarios to explore how they experience the team's expectations of alternative solutions. They jot down the positive and the negative consequences of each scenario on post-it notes, group them on a whiteboard and discuss them, scenario by scenario. The first one is their most preferred one. Hiring Christer while still keeping Vera. They quickly agree that it's not financially feasible, and that denying that

could also affect their credibility in the eyes of their partners.

The second scenario is to not hire Christer, pausing the process of taking him on as a CEO, while keeping Vera. Although acknowledging the risks of an excessive workload, they emphasise that the team would certainly regroup and do all in their power to make things work. The deflating effect of this scenario instead seems to lie in how it affects their visions for Swedes Included – their desire to scale up, to increase their social impact, to establish some kind of longevity and mark a greater presence of their ideas among the general public, as well as their ambition to create an organisation that is not dependent on them as founders. This line of thought seems to make it easy to quickly dispatch of the third scenario, not hiring Christer and still letting Vera go. ”This would be to just give up”, Roya says. They'd only continue doing what they're already doing, she adds, perhaps even less.

They iterate the essentialness of getting Christer in place, the need they see of getting a bigger ownership of their strategic work, to be less dependent on the strategic advisor that supports them extensively today and that has done so for most of their five years of existence. And the need to have a stronger and more long-term control of the organisation. ”It's not really about Christer as a person”, Roya says, ”it's about the stability we need to build”. And it's as if something suddenly dawns on her. ”It all gets so personal”, she says, ”as if it was about the individuals. Actually”, she continues, ”I'm going to stop saying Christer for now, until he's in place. I'm going to just say the CEO. And it's not about having to let Vera go, but about us having to let go of a project leader”.

Theme

My encounter with Swedes Included coincided with what seemed as an intense period of change for them. Although change, in the sense of motion, is of course always present, we seemed to meet at a time where their everydayness had opened up to indeterminacy, offering fewer recognisable beacons for them to navigate by. As I perceived it, they were in different ways asking themselves how to carry on, with what, and even *as* what. However, their vision for what they wanted to achieve seemed unaffected by the uncertainty. Their aim was to enhance social inclusion and integration in Sweden through the making of friendships between new and established swedes, that is, between immigrants who had more or less recently received their permanent residence in Sweden, and swedes who considered themselves more or less established in the country, since birth or later. They would do so primarily by matching new and established swedes in friendship pairs and enrol them in a six month friendship program, but also by conducting workshops with senior high-schools (*gymnasieskolor*) and arrange weekly social events open to the public. "We want to open up Sweden", as they told me, "that's our vision, and we think that Swedes Included can be a tool for doing that in different ways". The ambiguity seemed to rather be on how to move ahead with their ambition, how to carry through their intention for social change – with whom, with what, *as* what.

Swedes Included were navigating a domain – a sphere of knowledge, influence, or activity (Domain, n.d.) – of social entrepreneurship, an area defined in varying ways, perhaps due to the research on it being rather new (Sievers, 216), however often conceptualised as a combination of social and economic value creation and innovation, with the social entrepreneurial organisation thought of a hybrid form existing in the intersection between state, market and civil society, working with an explicit social aim (ibid). Swedes Included could of course have found themselves elsewhere, moving within other demarcations, interacting with other types of partners, given other forms to their ambition, or had it shaped by their navigation in other ways. Yet, this is where they were, and they were now carrying on in relation to delineations and categorisations performed not only by themselves, but by numerous actors, all with aims, visions and intentions of their own.

Thus, the domain of social entrepreneurship plays an inevitable part in grasping the context in which Swedes Included were moving. However, my interest is less in how this domain should be defined or what it *is*, and more in how Swedes Included navigated it and

interpreted the possibilities of this domain to serve their cause. Olivia and Roya didn't call themselves social entrepreneurs. They were however identified and called so by others, particularly by some of their key partners, and would regularly figure in different contexts where that label was a gathering and framing one. Also, they didn't necessarily disapprove of the labelling, although they didn't specifically identify with it either. They rather seemed to engage with the domain in a pragmatic way, trying to make use of its possibilities and mitigate its restrictions. Thus, I won't depart from social entrepreneurship as a given frame by which to approach Swedes Included. Instead, I will frame my analysis based on how Swedes Included were moving in relation to their intention, to that which they were reaching for and wanted to achieve. Yet, to do that, I also need to acknowledge and take into consideration the domain to which they were in different ways relating, either by being identified as social entrepreneurs by others, or by pragmatically trying to have the resources of that domain work to their benefit. In other words, this is not a thesis about social entrepreneurship or social entrepreneurs *per se*, but about *the practices and particularities of protecting, applying and advancing an intention for social change*, as performed by a non-profit organisation, navigating a domain of social entrepreneurship.

Analytical Focus

The prelude which I opened with indicates the main threads I will pull and knot with in the chapters to come. It points to the attempts of professionalising an organisation which has friendship tightly weaved into its fabric, not only in what the organisation wants to promote, but by the very friendships on which it is built. This thread of the personal, the challenges it poses and opportunities it provides, will run red through the thesis. And so will the thread of professionalisation, of wanting to establish a stability from which to expand, but also to reduce the dependency on the many partners that in different ways would define the demarcated space (de Certeau, 1984), or the space of power and will, that Swedes Included were navigating.

   At the heart of this thesis lies a distinction between two notions, that of the *bounded* and that of the *entwined* – between thinking with boundaries (Simmel, 1994) and thinking with lines (Ingold, 2007, 2011, 2015). Throughout I will contrast these notions as a way of contrasting conceptualisations of organisational life, suggesting that the notion of the entwined allows for a much more multifaceted understanding. I will speak of *bounded*

sociality, where people and organisations are understood to relate as entities, that "meet along their exterior surfaces" (Ingold, 2015, p. 10), that have insides and outsides, that in their encounter can either aggregate or meld. Thus, sociality seen as an interaction between enclosed 'bodies' surrounded by an environment in which other enclosed 'bodies' exist – as in the image of a network, a connection of dots. And I will speak of *entwined sociality*, where people and organisations are understood to relate by extending lines, that "wrap around one another, like the many strands of a rope" (ibid, p. 11), that in their encounter can coil around each other, and knot. Thus, a sociality where the line is not drawn between individual dots to indicate a connection, as in the image of the network, but where the line itself is the motion of life, of people and organisations issuing forth in the world, and the dots of the network instead are seen as knots, as an entanglement of lines in motion.

As a way of contrasting these notions of the bounded and the entwined, I will engage in an exploration of how *proximities and distances* can be seen to be made, suggesting that the notion of entwined sociality allows for a far more complex understanding than that of bounded sociality, in how it can, for example, paradoxically encompass proximities and distances at the same time. Consequently, by elaborating on the notion of entwined sociality through an exploration of proximities and distances, I hope to add to a diverse, vulnerable, and ambiguous knowledge-making of organisational life, and perhaps of life in general.

Contributions and Research Areas

As outlines above, this thesis takes an interest in "the organising processes and organisational dimensions of social interaction" (Garsten & Nyqvist, 2013, p. 21, n. 6), thus speaking to the area of organisational anthropology.

On a more specific level, it aims to add to research on social entrepreneurship by challenging seemingly set conceptualisations of how a social entrepreneurial practice might be understood. Instead of defining organisations and their people by who they work with, where they get their financing from, how they've set up their organisation or what they do with their surplus, I suggest to approach them by how they move in relation to that which they want to achieve, their intention, and how they carry on in the everyday to make that intention come true. As such, by perhaps ambivalently both addressing and denying social entrepreneurship as a delimited field of research, my ambition is also to contribute to establishing social entrepreneurship as an area within organisational anthropology, but

approached as an interrogative frame (Madden, 2010) continuously brought to life and questioned in its conceptualisations. Also because, in the existing literature on social entrepreneurship, which is rarely anthropological, there's a repeated request for more ethnographically based research (e.g., Mauksch, Dey, Rowe, & Teasdale, 2017; Berglund & Skoglund, 2016; Sievers, 2016; Dey & Stayaert, 2016; Barinaga, 2013; Berglund & Wigren, 2012), and for a stronger focus on the mundaneness of navigating the social entrepreneurial domain (e.g., Houtbeckers, 2016).

I however agree with Garsten and Nyqvist (2013) who suggest that "the study of organising is at the core of mainstream social anthropology" (ibid, p. 4) and should not be seen as a sub-discipline of anthropology, but as "deploying, adjusting, and advancing mainstream anthropological concepts and research tools for the study of organisations and processes of organising" (ibid, p. 14). And, I would suggest in a paraphrase to that quote, following and learning with an organisation could also be to study the mainstream, or the general variability and particularity of social life. Thus, the theories and perspectives applied in this thesis, as elaborated on in the section on theoretical frames, are not primarily organisational, but reflect the curiosity and the awe I feel with regards to how people, organisations, as well as organisms, make and navigate the world.

Hence, a distinction is important to make: this is not an analysis *of* and organisation, but an analysis *through* an organisation. The proximal relational and experiential particularities that will be conveyed in the pages to come are there to think with also in a wider curiosity about organisational and social life. Based on my fieldwork material, I hope to convey not only an account of how it can be to navigate a *specific* domain, but also suggest a notion, that of *carriership of intention*, which might add to a specifically organisational understanding of what it can be to navigate with an aim for social change in mind. Swedes Included's intention, as I understood it, was to enhance social inclusion and integration, to 'open up Sweden', changing people's attitudes and broadening their networks beyond the differentiation and segregation of new and established swedes. The continuous elaboration however was on *how* to do that. These considerations, in discourse as well as practice, of how to persevere in their attempts of making their intention come true, of how to protect, apply and advance their intention, is what I refer to as carriership. Thus, the notion of carriership of intention is less about how Swedes Included conceptualise or make sense of their intention, and more about the practices of carrying it through. As I will elaborate on in the theory section of this thesis, it's a practice-oriented notion which might allow for a diverse and

complex analysis of the organisational particularities and transformational imaginaries weaved into efforts for social change.

Aim and Research Question

The aim of this thesis is to add to a diverse and multifaceted understanding of what it might be to navigate, in particular, a domain of social entrepreneurship, and in general, a domain of social change. It departs from the overall question: what can we learn by following an organisation's practices of protecting, applying and advancing an intention for social change? And asks, more specifically: how is that intention navigated and negotiated in relation to partners and collaborators in the domain, how does it manifest itself in the everyday practices of the organisation, and how is it sustained in the encounter with uncertainty, indeterminacy and change?

Layout of Thesis

The first chapter sets the tone by a prelude that brings forth the dynamics of the personal and professionalisation, topics that will appear in different variations throughout the thesis. It continues by conveying the overall theme, the wider frame of thought if you will, as well as the research questions that will guide the analysis.

The second chapter gives a sense of my entry to the field as well as an overview of the non-profit organisation Swedes Included. I reflect there on the methodological particularities of my fieldwork and sketch the analytical frame that will inform my engagement with the fieldwork material.

The thereby following chapters, numbered one to four, are the analytical ones. The first explores the complexities of proximity and distance that are made as both Swedes Included and their partners try to know how, and if, they should relate to each other. The second homes in on the practices of making the personal, a notion perceived by the members of Swedes Included as a core of their organisation. The third one explores the threat of splitting such a core, suggesting that entwined notions of sociality might be more helpful than bounded ones in conveying the intricacies of transformation and change. The fourth and final one takes on a more conceptual and theoretical approach. It departs from the material of the prior analytical chapters, as well as from a final interview with the founders of Swedes Included, and reflects

on the everyday politics of scaling and motion in a complex dynamic of dependencies and opportunities.

The thesis then concludes with a chapter which takes a brief look back through the analysis and rounds up with suggesting some paths for future research.

Background

> "Of course, this is precisely the province of anthropology: to interrogate the familiar, to learn from the richness of everyday experience." (Sandler & Thedvall, 2017, p. 1)

Sparks of Curiosity – Encountering the Field

The journey towards this thesis began in April of 2016, when I first encountered the world of social entrepreneurship, in my role as organisational psychologist. I had been consulting for about eight years by then, and had gone from employee to independent around the end of 2013. By recommendation from a former colleague I was approached by Ava, then Swedish Country Manager at an incubator, a sort of organisation that supports social initiatives with expertise and sometimes funds, to develop them organisationally and help them grow. She wondered if I could help out, on a pro bono basis, on matters concerning their Transformation Makers (TMs), the individual social entrepreneurs they had enrolled in their program. I ended up advising Ava and a colleague of hers on ways to reframe their feedback to their TMs, so as to overcome communicational hurdles in their collaboration.

Later that year, a few weeks after having started the anthropology master program at Stockholm University, I held a one-hour presentation for a group of TMs, pro bono, still in the role of organisational psychologist. Aware of an upcoming one-week fieldwork exercise in the master program later that semester, I took the opportunity to connect with some of the TMs, with the idea of perhaps following two or three of them for some days and make some interviews. That week turned out to open the door to the fieldwork of this thesis, as Swedes Included was one of the organisations I got to engage with.

Throughout the master program I've been fascinated by matters of the interplay between agency, social forces and change, between the individual and the environment, or the idea of their separateness. As a psychologist I've mainly worked with corporate leadership in different ways, and always been interested in the idealisation and the demonization of the leader, and not least the assumption that an individual can be put in charge of, and be held accountable for, systemic transformation. Growing up with my aid-working mother in Colombia and on the Cape Verde islands, I also had a blend of both admiration and scepticism towards people wanting to heal, save or make better the world. My mother, responsible for operations at the time, discontinued the presence of the organisation she was working for on the Cape Verde islands. Her decision made an intriguing example of dealing

with the tension between an organisation wanting to help, and running the risk of becoming an obstacle to the local development of competence and socio-professional infrastructure.

Coming in contact with the social entrepreneurial domain indeed tickled various nerves of attention in me, with a special blend of admiration, curiosity and scepticism towards social entrepreneurship as a means for social change. Admiration and curiosity, for example, about the commitment of individuals who engage in the innovative and often economically risk-laden endeavour of social entrepreneurship, seemingly driven many times by strong personal values and beliefs. And scepticism about the actual possibility of achieving structural societal change from what seemed to me as a highly individualised domain, where heroes seemed to be made, praised and replaced, celebrated and then sometimes forgotten. Myself having the view that the mundane is political, as it (re)produces the world in its every step, I was interested to learn more about, and challenge my own preconceptions of what politics that were made within a social entrepreneurial practice. As it turned out, and which I will explore in more detail in the theory section of this thesis, that frame of though would take me to questioning the very idea of gathering those practices within a denominal frame of social entrepreneurship.

Swedes Included

I had met Olivia, one of the founders of Swedes Included, at the one-hour presentation I did for a group of TMs. For the fieldwork exercise that December of 2016, during which I hung out with a few different social entrepreneurs, I got to spend one full day with Swedes Included. The agreement was that I'd also share with them what I had presented to the TM's. When later preparing for the fieldwork of this thesis, in 2017, and eventually deciding to continue exploring the domain of social entrepreneurship, it seemed natural to do so with Swedes Included, building on the positive exchange we'd had in 2016.

They would present themselves as a non-profit organisation (*ideell icke-vinstdrivande förening*) active in the area of integration and social inclusion, with the aim to facilitate friendships between new and established swedes, that is, between immigrants who had more or less recently received their permanent residence in Sweden, and swedes who considered themselves more or less established in the country, since birth or later. To meet this aim they had developed a number of initiatives, such as a six-month friendship program, a number of workshops, and weekly social events. The founders and project leaders would also participate

in panels, make interviews and in other ways take part in the public discussion on matters of integration and social inclusion.

A large part of Swedes Included's operational work consisted in matching new and established swedes in friendship pairs that would then participate in their program. As I elaborate on later in the thesis, project leaders and interns would, based on interviews made with new swedes and online questionnaires filled out by established swedes, find two people they thought might appreciate each other's friendship, and suggest them to one another. If the suggestion was accepted by both, a first encounter would take place at a large friends'-first-meetup, held weekly, where twenty to forty pairs would meet for the first time to get to know each other better, with guidance from Swedes Included's project leaders, interns or volunteers. Swedes Included would then, for the duration of the six-month program, stay in touch with and follow up on the development of each friendship pair, offering direct support, membership benefits at a number of locations around the country, and also gather data to evaluate the impact on integration and social inclusion of their friendship-making efforts. Their revenue was partly based on funding they'd get from for example foundations, incubators, or EU-support, and partly on their cooperation with different municipalities. Swedes Included would offer to match the new swedes studying Swedish at the municipal SFI-schools[1], with established swedes which Swedes Included would themselves recruit. The business model was one where the municipalities would finance a certain amount of friendship matches over a period of time, most often a year. At the time of my fieldwork, Swedes Included had about fifteen municipalities they cooperated with.

Roya and Olivia had founded Swedes Included in 2013, while both volunteering at a large non-profit organisation. Starting off as a local group within that non-profit, Swedes Included would soon move on to being an organisation in its own right. Already in these early days, they would get support from CSES (*Centre for Social Entrepreneurs*), an incubator and provider of pro-bono business counselling. And only about half a year after having started up, they were discovered, as they put it, by another incubator, Incorporation Advocates, who identified them as social entrepreneurs and took them on to their strategic advisory program.

At the time of my fieldwork Swedes Included had a well-established operation in Stockholm and a growing one in the south of Sweden, as well as other potential locations in

---

[1] SFI-schools (Swedish for Immigrants / Svenska för Invandrare) are adult education facilities managed by municipalities, offering courses in Swedish to immigrants.

mind. With a larger team in Stockholm, and a small one in the south, they were eleven people all in all, a rather young setup with everyone between the ages of 25 and 35. There were the two founders, Roya and Olivia, and six employed project leaders, as well as a half-year rotating presence of three interns. Roya and Olivia would make up the management, supported by a board, and also by Nima, one of the Stockholm project leaders that functioned as the leader of that team. Roya's focus would be on operational matters, and Olivia would mainly focus on fundraising and partnership agreements of different sorts, and they would both be involved in most of the continuous administration. They were organised in two sections, one that worked with adults and mostly focused on friend-matching and social events, and one that worked with youth and mainly offered workshops to senior high-schools, to promote social inclusion and friendships among the students. The interns were all university students and the rest all had academic degrees of varying sorts. In addition they had a network of about forty volunteers that would support them in different ways, such as in the weekly friends'-first-meetups an the social events, but also in different efforts of communicating with and recruiting new participants.

Methods & Ethics

For me, engaging with Swedes Included was not only about engaging with a new organisation and with a new domain, but also engaging with a new methodology of knowledge making. As it turned out, with a MSc in psychology I could apply to the master program in social anthropology without having to do the bachelor. Three years saved, but also three years unexperienced. The fieldwork for this thesis, apart from the week long exercise in the first semester of the program, was my first, as the psychology program I had taken was taught in a positivist and quantitative tradition. Unsurprisingly, engaging anthropologically with the world seemed a bit daunting at first, but approaching it as a kind of exploration (Hannerz, 2006), letting it speak to my fondness of the unknown, I hope to eventually have used my attentive inexperience and my confusion of roles as tools for learning. In the following I hope to convey not only how humbling and challenging that learning experience was, but also how situations and decisions along the way may have mattered to how my analytical frame emerged and evolved. For, as anthropologist Jakob Krause-Jensen says, "method and analysis are inextricably interwoven, and the often-arduous process of negotiating entry – the 'distractions' – can be analytically revealing" (Krause-Jensen, 2013, p. 49). This process of entries was, as I experienced it, reoccurring, and would continuously afford the opportunity to reflect on proximities and distances made in the entanglement of anthropological practice.

A Feel For the Field

I would spend November and December of 2017 with Swedes Included, and also join them at a few occasions in January 2018 – attending an after-work, joining an internal workshop they held with a strategic advisor of theirs, and most importantly conducting a final and more extensive interview with Roya and Olivia just before definitively leaving the field. During those months I would be actively in the field almost every workday, usually during normal office hours, adjusting my presence to that of Swedes Included's work. I would spend most of that time at the office in Stockholm, a shared space of about 2400 square meters specifically developed by a philanthropist to host social entrepreneurs and tech developers, as a way of encouraging the digitalisation of social change. Swedes Included resided there along with, at the time, a little over two hundred other socially oriented organisations, such as social entrepreneurs, philanthropists and incubators. Apart from a few rooms with permanent

residents, the office space was mostly a combination of open areas, where people would find their working spot for the day, and a number of meeting rooms that could be booked by the hour or, in some cases, for weeks or months. Swedes Included had rented one of these for a longer period. The team of the adult section would normally reside there, as they needed a secluded space to make phone calls to presumptive and current participants in their friendship program. When in the office I would hang out a lot with them, listening in to what was going on, joining conversations and asking about things that caught my attention. I would also spend a lot of time with Roya and Olivia, tagging along as Nyqvist (2013) would have it, following them around to different meetings and events, internal ones as well as with external partners or collaborators.

Meetings actually turned out to be a considerable part of my fieldwork. Whatever was planned, evaluated or administered would be embedded in meetings, whether internal or external ones, formal or informal, scheduled or impromptu. Some were recurrent, as the weekly meeting Roya and Olivia had with Nora from their strategic advisor Incorporation Advocates, where everything about the organisation would be discussed. And some were singular, as the one I got to attend with the board. And of course, many where operational, with the team or also with Roya and Olivia, hammering out the practicalities of what they were going about.

Meetings, Sandler and Thedvall (2017) suggest, are for an organisation what pipes can be for water, carrying "ideas, practices, documents, language, and discussions" (ibid, p. 14). Yet, whether hidden or exposed, strictly functional or highly aesthetic, meetings are not just containers for that flow. Instead, they are themselves practices of circulation, "where ideas take form and power is worked out" (ibid, p. 15). For me, taking part in that circulation was indeed an experience of proximity to how Swedes Included as an organisation was made. Referring back to how method and analysis are inextricably interwoven (Krause-Jensen, 2013), that experience would also be mirrored in my curiosity about Swedes Included's own proximity to the circulatory practices of their domain. They wouldn't always have access to the pipes that carried practices that were decisive for them, such as the pipes of some partners and collaborators, a vulnerability I discuss in chapter one in almost arterial terms, as proximities and distances to what I call circulatory systems of decision making.

I was fortunate enough to be welcomed by Roya, Olivia and the team to almost everything they did. Thus, apart from numerous meetings, I would also participate in their friends'-first-meetups, help out with administering one of their weekly social events, join the

adult team in Stockholm for a day at an SFI-school to listen in on some of the interviews they made with new swedes, also attending a steering committee meeting with the management of that SFI-school, and joining the youth team to workshops they held at senior high-schools. Heading down to the south of Sweden for a two-day conference on social innovation, I also got to meet up with the southern team for a day, helping out with informing and recruiting new swedes at a local SFI-school, and joining one of the project leaders in a design workshop, held by Skype with some project leaders in Stockholm, to develop the workshops they held for senior high-schools.

Throughout the fieldwork, Swedes Included's external partners or collaborators would very rarely oppose to my presence. Quite to the contrary, they rather seemed to be curious about my being there and happy to share their own stories and perspectives on what was going on in their domain. That provided the opportunity to do four in-depth interviews with partners or peers outside of Swedes Included, and also to continuously, during meetings and in-between, get better knowledge about them through their own accounts. The interviews, apart from the final and more extensive one with Roya and Olivia, were mostly helpful in broadening my contextual understanding. With the focus on contrasting bounded and entwined sociality, exploring how proximities and distances were made in Swedes Included everyday practices, they would provide context, but don't specifically figure in my analysis. The same could be said about my gathering of printed and digital material. I would read reports that were mentioned and discussed during the fieldwork, as well as the presentational materials of their partners and collaborators, and I would keep myself updated on what was going on in Swedes Included's social channels. But as with the interviews, it mainly added to contextualisation, and is not specifically part of my analysis.

Participating, Observing, Navigating Roles

I think it's safe to say that most of my time was spent doing participant observation, or what Madden (2010, p. 16) refers to as "the idea that to know other humans the ethnographer must do as others do, live with others, eat, work and experience the same daily patterns". In my own words, engaging with people and their domains, experientially and analytically. Although I did a number of formal and recorded interviews, it was clear to me from the beginning that I didn't want to base my work on interviews alone, or even mainly. Not having done fieldwork before, and having read monographs with all those immersive experiences

that people had had, I was keen to learn something about this engagement of participation and observation which "remains at the core of all reasonable understandings of ethnography" (ibid, p. 16).

Distinguishing between the participant and the observer, O'Reilly (2009) describes the former as a member among members, and the latter as an outsider. Although perhaps immersed in the sense of "taking part in the very interactions on which social life is built" (ibid, p. 154), a participant without observation is no more than just that, a participant. And, consequently, an observer without a participant is simply not there, neither "metaphorically [nor] literally on the ground" (Lee & Ingold, 2006, p. 68). However, to engage in participant observation, O'Reilly contends, is to participate "in order to observe, notice, record, and try to make sense of actions and events" (ibid). In other words, participant observation, however explorative or immersive it might be, is done with an analytical purpose. It's participation with an aim of research in mind. But to underline the humbling and learning experience of it, and perhaps downplay the opportunistic and somewhat predatory connotations of observation, participant observation could also, as Ingold (2014) has it, be described as an education, and as such even a practice of exposure.

One of my major challenges and exposures to education would turn out to be the differentiation of roles, between the social anthropologist and the organisational psychologist. Not only for myself, which indeed had me reflecting extensively on my own analytical (in)attention, and how to rely on and critically appraise my automatized and preconceived identification of meaningful experiences. But also for others, both in terms of mitigating apprehensive notions of having a psychologist in the room, and of trying to divert addresses that seemed more readily directed at the organisational psychologist than the social anthropologist. I believe that the decision to primarily engage in participant observation, playing down the formal interviewing and thus the potentially scrutinising connotations of the psychologist, was crucial not only to letting myself digest, differentiate and perhaps eventually even cross-pollinate the roles and perspectives, but also to progressively establishing myself as an anthropologist in the field. Participant observation, it seemed, afforded me the possibility to attend to the pace of gradually building up trust. I would agree with Madden (2010) saying that "[r]apport-building is crucial to the ethnographic process and it can take some time to establish; one can't afford to rush things" (ibid, p. 16). A telling and somewhat brash example of that is how, when having lunch with the team on my first day of fieldwork, the nickname of 'the surveillant' (*övervakaren*) was bestowed upon me by one of

the project leaders. Starting off as what I perceived as an expression of scepticism and hesitation to my presence, it gradually evolved into a humorous and warm epithet, something we joked about, but which would continue to be used.

Thresholds and Threadings

To say that I was welcomed and that Swedes Included's partners and collaborators would not oppose to my presence, as mentioned above, is not to deny that the process of building trust indeed entailed thresholds to be crossed. Or, to say it in the ethnographical lingo of this thesis, instances of (un)threading that needed tending to. As with being named the surveillant.

But the most salient of thresholds was the confidentiality agreement (*sekretessavtal*) I had to sign before starting the fieldwork. It stated that I, during the fieldwork as well as in the thesis I would write, could not share any information that might harm Swedes Included or its relations with its partners, and that Roya and Olivia would have the right to read my thesis before its submission, to verify that it was in line with the agreement. In other words, it protected them from having me functioning as a leak. I saw the agreement as a 'deal breaker' at the time, a threshold of access that could only be passed by a signature. The thought of AAA's ethical guidelines stating 'do no harm' helped me cross it, as I knew that I wouldn't want to jeopardise their work.

I also felt that both Roya and Olivia were very keen on hearing my thoughts on all sorts of things, also when reflecting critically. I particularly remember a meeting with their strategic advisor in which Roya had just asked me, "Andreas, what do you think?", as she often did. But this time she turned smilingly to the others, adding, "I always ask that nowadays". These calls for participation were often threshold or trust threading moments of their own, and the whole fieldwork period wasn't enough for me to not feel a little perplexed each time they happened. But we always ended up talking about the boundaries of what I could actually say, as I'd been part of all sorts of meetings with varying levels of confidentiality. So I figured that my scope for writing challenging analyses would still be rather wide. And I didn't regard the confidentiality agreement as a sign of mistrust on their part. They had both stated how happy they'd be to have me with them for a while. But conscientious about utilising the support they were offered by different actors, they also said they'd have to check with their legal advisor if there was anything they should consider before going ahead.

It's hard to tell what the implications of this agreement has been on my fieldwork and the analytical work invested in the writing of this thesis. I can't say that I've felt inhibited in my analytical explorations, either during or after the fieldwork. And perhaps the time-consuming process of writing-up has also played its part, as things that were secrets at the time of my fieldwork are now part of the thesis, such as the possible merger with another organisation explored in chapter one.

Scribbles and Corporate Secrets

As Krause-Jensen (2013) says about his experience of doing fieldwork in an open office space, I was not very different from everyone else, carrying my notebook and laptop around. But as easy as it was in that sense to sink into the comfortableness of participation, there would be ample situations where I'd be abruptly brought back to awareness about also being an observer, not least in the eyes of others. For example, the project leader that had nicknamed me the surveillant would sometimes, three or four times during my fieldwork, quite unexpectedly ask me what I had just written down. A little bit put on a spot, every time, instinctively thinking that words would not be enough, and that these moments were also key moments to building trust, I would tell her some observation I'd taken note of and would also turn the notebook towards her for her to see. I can't say she looked very carefully, but the initiative seemed to help in threading some proximity. My scribbles are honestly sometimes hard to decipher even for my myself, but I still developed a cautiousness about what I'd put down during meetings, although no-one else was really interested to have a look. Working more with keywords and somewhat vague annotations, I would then take time, while in the office room with the adult team or alone in another area, to hammer out some specificities before the scribbles would turn to abstractions.

On the same note, looking back at my annotations about half-way into the fieldwork, I was surprised at how elaborate and long they had been the first weeks, and how sparse they had become. Unexpectedly being asked what I'd written wasn't enough to have had that effect. Instead I realised that, while taking notes in meetings, I had started to have a feeling of writing down corporate secrets. Perhaps it was the confidentiality agreement taking a toll at me. Or perhaps it was a sign of having become way more entangled with Swedes Included since the start, even developing a sense of responsibility and protectiveness to their cause – a sort of belongingness if you will. As such it might illustrate how a desire to participate, to get

beyond the often-arduous process of negotiating entry which Krause-Jensen (2013) talks about, might also open for a numbing of the observer, the analysing fieldworker, making it harder not only to reflect in action, as happenings occur, but also to reflect on action, at the post-fieldwork desk of ethnographic writing, having deprived oneself of valuable material. This was a wake-up call indeed to retake the lengthiness of taking notes.

Strangeness and Familiarity

I was doing fieldwork in what Krause-Jensen (2013) calls a deceptively familiar environment. Focusing my "ethnographic curiosity on people with practices not so unlike [my] own" (Hannerz, 2006, p. 24), I could be said to be studying sideways. The people I was engaging with were also used to having researchers around, although these would mostly be from other disciplines than anthropology. Myself living in Stockholm at the time, and working there as an organisational psychologist, I could also be said to be studying 'at home' (Jackson, 1987). Although often the case in organisational anthropology, according to Krause-Jensen (2013), studying 'at home' poses a challenge, as "the *raison d'être* of doing anthropological analysis in organisations is to shake the reader out of mundane understandings and conceptual complacency" (ibid, p. 44, italics in original). And here I was, in a sense studying 'at home' both geographically and thematically. Yet, as Krause-Jensen also claims, "strangeness does not start at the other side of the ocean but at the tip of your nose" (ibid, p. 45). Organisational settings, he adds, "often involve activities requiring expert knowledge and highly specialised skills" (ibid, p. 49). And indeed, although Swedes Included's practices might have appeared straightforward enough at first, even volunteering would had meant going through a process of formation. As such, the particularities of their world making and the domain they were navigating seemed to afford the necessary estrangement for the reflecting observer.

Perhaps an anthropological participation, a participant observation, is one which strives to partake from an orientation of surprise, and thus one which gains from directing its analytical curiosity towards experiences that contradict a sense of recognition – be it amazement, awe, bewilderment or a feeling of being lost and far away from home. In line with O'Reilly's (2009) account on participant observation, the observation then is not so much a looking at, in silence or from a distance or however an observational pose is imagined, but rather an attentive proximity to the non-confirmatory experiences of the irregular. Referring back to

Krause-Jensen's words about the inextricable entanglement of method and analysis, I would describe my own experiences of 'entering' the field as more thread-like than threshold-like, of weaving trust rather than gradually approaching a state of 'insideness'. This, in turn, has most likely influenced how I eventually would turn my attention also to the proximities and distances that Swedes Included were navigating, and how that might tell a story about an understanding of organisational life as entwined rather than bounded.

Ethics and Integrity

This whole section on methods is, as I see it, sprinkled with ethical considerations, understood as the continuous attention to where lines are drawn by others as well as oneself, respecting both the people one engages with and the research itself. As such there are ethical dimensions to keeping one's notebook safe from prying, as well as to using it in ways that allow for unexpected displays, just as there are ethical dimensions to protecting one's digital scribbles and accounts with a reasonable level of password and encryption security. But most importantly, in my experience from this fieldwork, there is the attention to the relational lines of privacy that are drawn and to the respecting of people's integrity.

When the possible layoff of Vera was disclosed, an acute vulnerability seemed to be introduced into Swedes Included's circulatory system, which I explore in chapter three. Swedes Included were not only promoting friendships as a means of social inclusion, they were also to a large extent an organisation itself made up of friends. To lay off a friend seemed to me, as I experienced it then, as a rupture to the very notion of who they were. As a result, the visitor and outsider that I was, however much appreciated, was suddenly very much brought into awareness. A few minutes into the meeting where the layoff would be discussed, Roya took me aside and told me that Vera, who had learned about her possible dismissal a few hours before and still hadn't showed up to the meeting, wasn't comfortable with having me in the room. I would tell Vera later that day how much I had appreciated the line she had drawn, how helpful it had been also to me, in learning to navigate the field. We ended up having a candid and opening exchange about managing the boundaries of trust.

This experience was also helpful for me in more actively deciding on when to *not* participate and observe. Referring back to my discussion on the balancing of roles, it became easier to discern when my presence might have hindered rather than helped my research. As a result I would exclude myself from some meetings where I might have gained a deeper

insight into the personal matters of the personnel, choosing not to know, and thereby also making myself inaccessible on those matters as a potential advisor on organisational psychology.

Perhaps ethics in the end is about protecting the process of research, exposing oneself to the education of entangling the participant and the observer, remaining attentive to how the people we engage with will help in drawing and redrawing those lines of chalk.

A Theoretical Departure – Research on Social Entrepreneurship

As described in the introduction, my fieldwork could come to challenge my initial understanding of Swedes Included as social entrepreneurs. Yet, the notion of social entrepreneurship still seemed to play a significant part, not least in how they were conceived of and related to by others. Thus, as I might seem to rather ambivalently both speak and not speak about social entrepreneurship in this thesis, I need to start this section on theory by framing the theoretical relevance of the domain, to show how it is that I both want to add to the research area, while simultaneously saying that my work is not about social entrepreneurship *per se*. What I want is to add to research on social entrepreneurship by conveying, as other researchers are doing in their own way, how departing from fixed conceptual frames might occlude the very diversity and heterogeneity of the field.

Social entrepreneurship is a contested research area, both in terms of conceptualisations and of what agendas that go into it. The debate on how to define it is ongoing and seems to depend, at large, on how one draws the lines for both social and entrepreneurial. As such, it's often conceptualised as a combination of social and economic value creation and innovation, with the social entrepreneurial organisation thought of a hybrid form existing in the intersection between state, market and civil society, working with an explicit social aim (Sievers, 2016). For example, Thomas, Persson and Hafen (2014) suggest it to be "processes aimed at solving societal problems in new ways, with innovative ideas and methods [taking] place in the borderland between industry, the public sector and civil society" (ibid, p. 8). Also, the notion of hybridity, "the tension-ridden relation between social mission and the financial goals, as a defining and stable characteristic of social enterprises" (Mauksch et al., 2017, p. 116), is often combined with an understanding of social entrepreneurship as ventures having taken market logics to the social domain (Barinaga, 2013).

Ester Barinaga, who has done ethnographic work also in Sweden, argues that the focus on the entrepreneurial, at the expense of the social, has resulted in an understanding of social entrepreneurship as either "market-oriented income-generation strategies or as innovative methods", which, in her view, "tends to re-describe social problems as economic and make them objects of managerial expertise" (ibid, p. 349). The consequence she sees is a depolitisation of the social. Rarely criticising or problematising the rationale behind social entrepreneurship, thus rarely questioning what it sets out to change, research on social entrepreneurship "usually points to its benefits, rather than to what its assumed benefits may

mean politically." (Berglund & Skoglund, 2016, p. 79). As several authors argue (Barinaga, 2013; Sievers, 2016; Berglund & Wigren, 2012), such a normative stance and research agenda tends to hide the blurred lines and productive entanglements of social entrepreneurship with other socially oriented endeavours. As I will expand on later in this chapter, by pointing to organisations with a social aim as carriers of intention, I hope to add to the possibility of finding new entries to researching the politics that are made, both within the field and in the realisation of its goals.

Social entrepreneurship is a relatively new area of research (Sievers, 216), and much of the research has been done by sociologists, economists, management scholars and organisational psychologists. Much of it is far from ethnographic, and thus, in the literature that can be said to methodologically relate to anthropology, the call for ethnographic studies is recurrent (e.g., Mauksch et al., 2017; Berglund & Skoglund, 2016; Sievers, 2016; Dey & Stayaert, 2016; Barinaga, 2013; Berglund & Wigren, 2012). As such, a dominant research focus on economic, managerial and entrepreneurial aspects (visible for example in the hybridity analogy mentioned above) is seen to hinder, for example, a deeper understanding of the mundaneness of social entrepreneurship (Houtbeckers, 2016), the local and variegated interdependencies with other sectors in society (Berglund & Wigren, 2012), the alternative and non-market oriented rationalities that might be underlying their practices (Barinaga, 2013), as well as the minutiae of how ethics is actually done, far from the idealised image of the social entrepreneur as inherently righteous (Dey & Stayaert, 2016). Exemplifying with Dey and Stayaert, they raise the risk of value-based descriptions making the view of the social entrepreneur a static and essentialist one, a concern I believe is implicitly expressed by many authors in their desire to problematise and diversify the understanding of the area.

My wish is to approach Swedes Included disregarding the denomination of them as social entrepreneurs, but without being naïve about to the politics of the domain. Perhaps much of the conceptual labour done in regard to social entrepreneurship is more about what different parties would like social entrepreneurs to be – a desire and perhaps a contemporary societal need to create the social entrepreneur by discourse and practice. The social entrepreneurs' own relation to the term might in itself be a poor help for delimiting the field. Some individuals and organisations might be keen to be addressed as social entrepreneurs primarily for the opportunities the domain provides. As shown by Dey and Teasdale (2016), both non- and for-profit organisation can act 'as if' being social entrepreneurs, in order to get access to valuable resources. Building on de Certeau's (1984) notions of strategy and tactics, which I

also will elaborate on later in this chapter, they refer to these 'as if' practises as tactical mimicry, "theatre-like acts whereby individuals conform to government stipulations of social enterprise in order to exploit them" (Dey & Teasdale, 497). They however oppose to simply viewing practitioners of tactical mimicry as cynics. Instead, they suggest, tactical mimicry could be understood to describe a form of productive resistance, where those left with only tactical means could still access institutionalised goods, without having to be institutionalised themselves in the encounter.

The considerations laid out above have contributed to my approach, of contrasting bounded and entwined notions of organisational life, as I believe that such a contrast in itself can be helpful in splintering off the field of social entrepreneurship into more complex, vulnerable and productively ambiguous conceptualisations.

Analytical Frame || Tapestry of Thought

> "The challenge before us, in our exploration of the life of lines, is to consider how a reversion to the knot, after a period during which blocks, chains and containers have remained the paramount figures of thought, could impact on our understanding of ourselves, of the things we make and do, and of the world we live in." (Ingold, 2015, p. 15).

As detailed in the introduction, the notions of bounded and entwined sociality lie at the heart of this thesis, and I will be contrasting them continuously as a way of contrasting conceptualisations of organisational life. As such, I will engage in an exploration of how *proximities and distances* can be seen to be made, suggesting that the notion of entwined sociality allows for a far more complex understanding than that of bounded sociality, in how it can, for example, paradoxically encompass proximities and distances at the same time. A differentiation of the words entwined and entangled might also be helpful here, as entwined suggests a twining of lines in a more general sense (Entwine, n.d.), while entanglement also opens for more tension ridden, complex and ambiguous interlacing (Entangle, n.d.). Thus, I will use entwined when referring to contrasting notions of sociality, and entanglement when referring to the particularities and ambiguities of coiling and knotting that go on in the everydayness of Swedes Included's work.

My thinking and analysis throughout this thesis relies heavily on Tim Ingold's (2007, 2011, 2015) writings on what he calls the life of lines. In the following I will briefly map out the essentials of this perspective.

Life of Lines

Ingold's writings suggests a view of sociality as a tangle of lines, where people and organisms "extend along the multiple pathways of their involvement in the world" (Ingold, 2011, p. 70), encountering and entangling with each other. As such, he says, they occur rather than exist, as "each is a moment of ongoing activity" (Ingold, 2007, p. 90). In his own way distinguishing between the bounded and the entwined, Ingold speaks of *blobs* and *lines*. Blobs are bounded entities, they take up space, can "expand and contract, encroach and retrench" (Ingold, 2015, p. 3), but like oil on water they're either separate, or meld to become one. What they do is provide "volume, mass, density: they give us materials" (ibid, p. 4). Lines, which have none of that, but instead extend towards and tangle with other lines, provide "torsion, flexion and vivacity. They give us life." (ibid) And life, he says, "will not be contained, but rather threads its way through the world along the myriad lines of its relations" (Ingold, 2007, p. 103).

Thus, at the heart of Ingold's view of social life lies motion. Noting that most anthropologists might think of kinship charts when thinking of relational lines, he uses those as an example of how social life is often portrayed as a network of dots, as lines between blobs if you will. The line, in that image, is no more than a connector. By instead letting the lines coil and tangle where they in the image of the network would just reach their final point, the dot transforms from a bounded entity into a *knot*. This image of the knot is, in my view, central to understanding Ingold's view of sociality, as it illustrates both the particularity of relationships and the composition of wider relatedness. Clarifying by contrast, Ingold elaborates on what knots are not: they're not building blocks which assemble by their surfaces, as "the constitutive strands of each knot, as they extend beyond it, are bound into others" (Ingold, 2015, p. 15); they're not chains, put together from rigid elements, as they don't connect and have no links; and they're not containers, with insides and outsides, as "[t]heir surfaces do not enclose but lie 'between the lines' of the materials that make them up" (ibid). The knot, he says, "is about how contrary forces of tension and friction, as in pulling tight, are generative of new forms. And it is about how forms are held in place within such a force-field" (ibid, p. 18). Thus, in Ingold's view, knotting is also about establishing a *correspondence* between lines, about a tending to the tension of the knot, and as such about answering and being answered to. As he puts it, "social life lies not in the accretion of blobs but in the correspondence of lines" (ibid, p. 11). As such, he adds, *knotting* is also the

fundamental principle of coherence.

The coherence he speaks of is one that is not bounded but entwined. It is not held together by the boundaries drawn around it, but by the distribution of variable tension among knots. As a result, Ingold suggests, what we normally conceive of as an environment, surrounding the bounded, could instead be conceived of a *domain of entanglement*: "It is within such a tangle of interlaced trails, continually ravelling here and unravelling there, that beings grow or 'issue forth' along the lines of their relationships" (Ingold, 2011, p. 71). Thus, a domain should not be understood as a network of enclosed entities, but as an entanglement of lines in motion. As a result, what we normally conceive of as a network could instead be conceived of as a meshwork: "a tissue of trails that together comprise the texture of the lifeworld" (Ingold, 2011, p. 70).

In the analytical chapters, I will be using these boundary defying notions to explore how Swedes Included tangled – with others in the domain of social entrepreneurship, with the members of their friendship program, even among themselves.

Tying back to the distinction between bounded and entwined, there's one more concept, that of *inversion*, which is important to my analysis. Building on motion, as mentioned above, Ingold describes inversion as the very motion which might lead one to thinking of life and sociality as bounded. To effect an inversion, he says, is to fold an organism in on itself, as in a spiralling motion, "such that it is delineated and contained within a perimeter boundary, set off against a surrounding world – an environment – with which it is destined to interact according to its nature" (Ingold, 2011, p. 69). Exemplifying with the motion of drawing a circle, enclosing something, he stresses the need to distinguish the drawn circle, the blob if you will, from the motion of drawing it. The latter is what captures the line of life. Effecting an inversion, instead, "leads us to imagine the living being that has thus spiralled in on itself as an externally bounded object, deceiving us into thinking that it is not so much a movement in itself as a container for life" (Ingold, 2015, p. 54).

I will be applying this notion of the inversion in my exploration of how Swedes Included created a sense of having a core, as I suggest that this core could rather be seen as them spiralling in on themselves, affecting an inversion, interpreting a motion around a notion as a bounded essence of who they were as an organisation.

Additional Analytical Threads

While the first three chapters are ethnographically more elaborate and rely heavily on Ingold's writings, the fourth chapter is more conceptual and brings in a wider set of theoretical threads, as I there discuss what I call dependencies and opportunities within a domain of social entrepreneurship, and end up suggesting an alternative conceptualisation of Swedes Included's motion in the world.

Chapter four is to a large extent a discussion on the politics of making one's way in, or navigating, a domain of social entrepreneurship. In addition to Ingold's highly motion oriented theories, I relate there to the notion of social navigation (Vigh, 2007, 2009), conveying a sense of motion through social space. As an analytical concept it "directs our attention to the fact that we move in social environments of actors and actants, individuals and institutions, that engage and move us as we move along" (ibid, 2009, p. 420). Thus, as sailing an ocean with a destination in mind, navigating is politically about having to simultaneously "secure ones immediate survival and to gain strategic possibilities" (Vigh, 2007, p. 132).

This political motion is explored throughout the thesis, in how Swedes Included in different ways protect, apply and advance their intention for social change. In the fourth chapter it is however approached more in terms of their imaginaries about the future and their ambitions to increase their impact and scale. Discussing that, I also briefly bring in de Certeau's (1984) and Tsing (2012). With de Certeau to discuss the power that comes with the ability to establish a demarcated space from which to exercise one's will, and the tactical navigation by those, such as Swedes Included, that have to relate to the political space established by others. And with Tsing, to discuss the diversity and heterogeneity that is occluded by the establishment of such space, particularly with regards to how the precision design of scalability, requiring uniformity in every part of an endeavour, tends to separate into winners and losers those accepting scaling as an ideal.

But, as the theories weaved into the fourth chapter all entangle with the lines extended from Ingold's thoughts, and as they're developed at more length in the analysis of the chapter, I will content here with this brief indication of their eventual appearance.

Finally, I end the fourth chapter by introducing the notion of *carriers of intention*. I suggest there that, based on my fieldwork material, carrier of intention might be a more constructive denomination than that of social entrepreneur, as it does not depart from the

domain that is being navigated, but on the practices of carrying an intention through, regardless of domain – protecting, applying and advancing an intention for social change.

1. The Environment ‖ Domain of Entanglement

> "Blobs […] may bump into one another, aggregate together, even meld into larger blobs rather like drops of oil spilled on the surface of water. What blobs cannot do, however, is cling to one another, not at least without losing their particularity in the intimacy of their embrace. For when they meld internally, their surfaces always dissolve in the formation of a new exterior." (Ingold, 2015, p. 3)

As mentioned in the background, Swedes Included's were engaged in promoting friendships between new and established swedes. To carry that intention through, they were dependent on a wide range of partners and collaborators – from municipalities to corporations, from incubators to philanthropists and foundations – partners that in different ways would request their services or support their cause, either financially or with expertise, and sometimes both. Their partners would also have ideas, suggestions, and sometimes demands on how Swedes Included should go about achieving their task, or how they should evolve as an organisation. As a result, Swedes Included, although enjoying the support of a vast array of partners, also had to work actively on differentiating their own intention from that of others – navigating and negotiating proximities and distances, or, as Ingold has it in the quote above, finding ways of clinging without losing their particularity in the intimacy of their embraces.

This chapter takes an interest in that navigation and negotiation. More specifically, I home in on the complexity of proximities and distances that are made as both Swedes Included and their partners try to relate to how, and if, they should cling to one another. Thus, I here initiate the analytical contrasting of bounded and entwined sociality, of thinking about organisational life as happening between blobs or in an entanglement of lines.

Entries

To begin this exploration of contrasting notions, what better way to enter the ethnographic area than with a door. This specific one was located at an SFI-school in the municipality of St. Remedy. We were there to do interviews with new swedes. Swedes Included had a room on the third floor of the building, with their logo and a schedule of their presence by the door.

I had headed down to the staff lunch room with Olivia to take a break. Heading back up, walking out the lunch room with Olivia behind me, I suddenly heard her exclaim enthusiastically: "this is where it all started!" She would describe to me later how this specific municipality really had been with them from the beginning, how they'd meant everything for making Swedes Included happen. But right there, as I turned around, slightly

startled by her sudden outcry, I saw her pointing vigorously at a closed door just outside the lunch room of the staff. "We had this room at first", she said, "they offered it so that we'd have one fixed location where the students could find us." Swedes Included was just her and Roya back then, and they would come here regularly to do interviews. "But then we felt that it was a bit off from where the students actually hung out", she continued, "so we got that other room, where we are now."

A shift of doors can mean nothing, or can perhaps mean quite a lot. Either way, it could be helpful to think with, for example in understanding something about how Swedes Included were navigating and negotiating proximities and distances – to St. Remedy, to the students, and their own entanglement with the two. They were, I suggest, searching for entries, literally as well as symbolically, that would allow them to connect with the students, to then, as a result, inspire friendships between the new and the established swedes. As I mentioned in the introduction, they phrased their vision for social inclusion as wanting to open up Sweden, and to that end, as Roya and Oliva would put it, "friendships are good, because they're voluntary and reciprocal." This relational interlacing or connecting of the new and the established was, as I understood it, what they ultimately aimed to achieve.

To connect, or to bridge as Simmel (1994) would have it, is also to assume a separateness. Yet, it's an assumed separateness that relies on already having thought of two things as related, to "have emphasized these two together against whatever lies between them." (ibid, p. 5). For Swedes Included, in their efforts to contribute to social inclusion, the separateness they assumed, and the things they thereby considered to be related, seemed to be that of the new and the established swede. Their shift of doors could, in that sense, be understood as part of their search for mediaries that could afford (Gibson, 2015) or offer the possibility of an encounter. The door, Simmel says, "represents in a more decisive manner how separating and connecting are only two sides of precisely the same act" (Simmel, 1994, p. 7). In its closing off as well as opening up to, quite differently to the mute wall which merely separates, or the bridge that merely connects the finite to the finite, "the door speaks." (ibid). By cutting out a unity in the continuity and infinity of space, the door offers "the possibility of a permanent interchange" (ibid, p. 8). The possibility invested in the shift of doors at the SFI-school could perhaps be seen as that of Swedes Included advancing their intention for social change. Doors to speak of new beginnings, if you will, doors to speak of hope (Swedberg, 2017).

Affinities and Amity

Navigating proximities is also, as I perceived it from my encounter with Swedes Included, to navigate affinities. I use affinities here in the general sense of the word, of a liking and sense of connection for someone or something (Affinity, n.d.), as in a good match. In other words, a sense of proximity to something, imagined or real, which speaks to something in oneself, as a person or as an organisation.

By shifting doors, by shifting from an initial proximity to the staff, to a proximity to the students, Swedes Included were not only making themselves more visible and accessible to the students. By locating themselves in their midst rather than in the vicinity of the staff, they could also be seen to explore, or even manifest, in practice, their own affinities – the connection to be made through the door was not ultimately that between themselves and St. Remedy, but that between themselves and the students, the new swedes.

At one of the reoccurring steering committee meetings at St. Remedy, where Swedes Included would meet with representatives of the SFI-school, the project leaders Vera and Nima had just presented the latest numbers on participation of new swedes from St. Remedy, in their program and in their social events. Jera, the operational manager of St. Remedy's adult education section, seemed pleased. "By what do we measure our partnership", she asked rhetorically. "I can scrap the last ten of the hundred friend matchings, if the ninety you've done are good." Instead she underlined the great value she saw added by Swedes Included's social events and the importance of the many activities that St. Remedy and Swedes Included arranged together, from conferences to public events. From Jera's perspective, the cooperation with Swedes Included seemed tailored to the primary task of the SFI-school, to shorten the time the new swedes spent between getting their residency and earning their living. As it seemed, rather than an intermediary, Swedes Included would function as a leverage for St. Remedy's ambitions. "It's not only about language, but about the whole process of integration", Jera continued, "and actually, personal development is also specifically stated as a goal for adult education in the national Education Act (*skollagen*)". She emphasised Swedes Included as an example of a partner that could contribute to those aims. As they interacted with the students in settings less formal than that of the SFI-school, they would also be involved in the students' social and language development in ways that were beyond the scope of the municipality. However, Jera added, as St. Remedy didn't have access to Swedes Included's data on each individual, they also had no way of really knowing,

on the level of the specific student, if and how their cooperation actually added to their goals.

Perhaps then, weaving back to the shift of doors, we can continue reflecting on the interlacing of proximities and distances. While expressing their affinity with the students, Swedes Included's shift of doors could also be seen, on a scale of vision rather than exchange, to increase their proximity to St. Remedy. For St. Remedy, the possibility of offering the new swedes in their municipality an entry to friendships with established swedes outdid their need to obtain information on the development of the new swedes through Swedes Included; the possibility of relatedness, and integration as Jera would have it, outdid the gains of rendering their students measurable. Returning to Jera's rhetorical question, of by what to measure their partnership, Sofia, the principle of the SFI-school who was also present at the steering committee meeting, added a comment that perhaps spoke more to the area of hope than that of prediction, and thus more to the area of trust than that of measurability: "Swedes Included", she said, "is an alternative that actually resembles marrying an established swede, and we know that those who do come in [to society] much faster". It was as if St. Remedy consented to a partnership with Swedes Included where they'd provide doors, quite literally, by which Swedes Included could access the students, but where St. Remedy agreed to not cross those thresholds themselves, refraining from governing something which was beyond their municipal responsibilities. By her comment, Sofia could be seen to set up a bridge between family and friendship, between kinship and amity, suggesting that while different, they were still related. Through the marriage-equivalent of friendship, the new swedes would gain access to a realm of insideness; the separateness dissolved, the stranger turned family or friend, kin or amicus. Sofia could be seen to point at a door of kinship and amity in the intricate space of social inclusion, an entry which, by cutting out a unity in the continuity and infinity of that space (Simmel, 1994), offered access to a place well beyond the formal structure of the SFI-school. That room was distant to the municipality, also by choice, but proximal by proxy through their partnership with Swedes Included.

The proximity of a friendship differs from that of kinship in, at least, the sense of not entailing an entanglement of blood lines. The knots being tied are others than those of marriage. Yet, this interlacing of kinship and amity can perhaps help in thinking about the proximity between Swedes Included and the municipalities. These relations were not merely ones of negotiating positions, as entities in an environment, but of cooperational weaving, of contradictory and complex affiliations and intentions, interwoven in an entanglement of

cooperation on social inclusion. To speak of connected arteries is perhaps a bit exaggerated, yet the analogy occurs to me as I reflect on how different the decision making processes could be in Swedes Included's cooperation with different municipalities, as well as with other partners. If a process of cooperation could be seen as a circulatory system of decision making, the proximity, or the distance, that Swedes included would have to a specific municipal artery could indeed, as I'll get into below, have major implications.

Artery and Entanglements

With the fifteen municipalities that Swedes Included worked with at the time of my fieldwork, their cooperation was based on a business model where the municipalities would finance a certain amount of friendship matches over a period of time, most often a year. However, with a few of the municipalities, including St. Remedy, they also had a special sort of formalised partnership, a so called IOP-agreement (*Civil Public Partnership / Idéburet Offentligt Partnerskap*). The IOP-agreement was not regulated by law, as were procurement processes. Instead, each agreement would be set up differently, in ways that would best combine the partners' agendas. The aim would be to move away from a relational frame of contractors and clients, to instead establish long term commitments, less transactional and more focused on reaching common goals, together. As Roya had put it when introducing me to Swedes Included, with these partnerships they became part of the municipality's strategy for integration, rather than just being a provider of services. The IOP-agreements would afford, as it were, a proximity of intention, of joint ways "in which action [could be] cognitively and emotionally pointed toward some purpose" (Ortner, 2006, p. 134). They seemed to afford a pragmatic flexibility which, weaving back to how Roya described friendships, also seemed both voluntary and reciprocal. Where they did not have an IOP-agreement, the indeterminacy of Swedes Included's work could be much more severe. Or, to put it differently, where they lacked in proximity to a municipality's circulatory system of decision making, the possibility for them to perceive shifts in the intricacy of their cooperation was strongly restricted.

At one occasion, in late December, Roya was again trying to get hold of someone at the municipality of Mount Gallow, which they'd had problems getting a final decision from, on whether they would continue or perhaps even extend the agreement they'd had with Swedes Included the past year. This time an official they'd been in contact with before finally picked

up the phone. It didn't take many seconds to learn that Mount Gallow had decided not to renew the partnership with Swedes Included. As it turned out, the decision had been made at least a month earlier. "But couldn't we have had a conversation in November and perhaps found a smaller agreement", Roya said. The official agreed, "yeah, perhaps we could have figured out that we'd be having much narrower frames". In February they'd be more likely to know whether there'd be any opportunities at all to continue their cooperation, she continued, lamenting the situation and assuring Roya that she believed strongly in what Swedes Included were doing, that she herself had gotten a friend through them. "The costs for integration are being questioned", she said, "which means that we cannot make decisions about anything that is not legally required"; regardless of how things would turn out, it was very likely that a traditional procurement process would be required to cooperate.

Again, the interlaced proximities of their cooperations came to the fore as the official at Mount Gallow, herself a prior member of Swedes Included's friendship program, had to be the one to deliver the unsettling news about a decision made well beyond the influence of Swedes Included. "Our municipality contracts make us reactive", as Roya would remark at several occasions during my fieldwork. "We can only respond to their formal requests, but not to the actual demand among the people that live there."

In their efforts to advance their intention for social change, Swedes Included were continually searching for additional and alternative paths, other cooperational entanglements, some of them more arterial than others. As explored in the next section, one such was to tie the knots with another organisation.

Boundedness and Inversion

In early November 2017, Roya and Olivia had gathered the whole team to give an update on the process of a possible merger. This was no news to the team, as a pilot project was well underway already to explore the possibility of combining their work. Olivia and Roya were now reiterating the specificities of the two possibly becoming one. They described the organisation, Agency for Inclusion, as having a similar profile to theirs – although differing in methods and business model, both organisations addressed integration and social inclusion by connecting new and established swedes in friendships. While Swedes Included focused on a six month program, manually matching friends based on on-line surveys and interviews, Agency for Inclusion focused on easy-access one-time meetings, arranged by the users

themselves through a smart phone application, and without structured continuation. According to Oliva and Roya, they shared the same values and addressed the same issues, but on different levels and in different ways. Olivia and Roya highlighted the advantages of the advanced matching algorithms and application management tools that Agency for Inclusion had developed already, much like a system Swedes Included themselves had been developing with Microsoft, before Microsoft went through a major reorganisation and from one day to the next cancelled the project and all their support of it – a far from arterial relation. Olivia and Roya stressed that the key was not for Swedes Included to work more in the methodology of Agency for Inclusion, but to combine their strengths and increase their impact, while maintaining the quality in the meetings Swedes Included set up.

To merge is perhaps more than just creating new entanglements, rather in the vein of an arterial reconfiguration. More than an intimate embrace, in which the clinging is made with attention to not losing one's particularity (Ingold, 2015), a merger between organisations perhaps implies a shift also of internal make-up, of roles and responsibilities, as well as a transformation of self-interpretation, of how to understand the connection between one's daily work and one's vision, the why of what one is doing. From a perspective of boundedness, a merger can perhaps be seen as a reinterpretation of what lies inside and what lies outside. Boundaries, Cohen (1985, p. 14) suggests, "enclose elements which may, for certain purposes and in certain respects, be considered to be more like each other than they are different." From what Roya and Olivia were conveying, differences did exist between Swedes Included and Agency for Inclusion, but their similarities, and the possibility of what they could achieve together, seemed to outdo them. Yet, as indicated by the continuation of the meeting depicted below, as boundaries also mark off "elements from those which differ" (ibid, p. 14), a potential merger might raise questions about where to draw the line.

As the meeting went on, concerns began to be aired. "Of course we want as many people as possible to meet, but we really need to make sure to keep the quality", as one team member put it, continuing: "My concern is that by moving into productivity we'll also lose the core of what we are". The concern was echoed by another member pointing to an effect in the pilot project, where it had been easier to get participants to the one-time meetings than to the six month program. "We really need to get people into the program, but it seems that the smaller municipalities prefer the lower threshold." Another team member added: "The municipalities really like the cooperation with Agency for Inclusion, but they also clearly want the closeness that we can offer. The simplicity of Agency for Inclusion is a real plus,

but the lack of personal contact is also a huge risk." Roya came back to how she perceived their current business model to make them reactive to the municipalities, hindering them from being able to directly address the actual demand: "As I see it, we either need to create something with a lower threshold, or we need to merge with someone who has such a solution. It's an upgrade of Swedes Included that makes it possible for us to reach our vision."

As it seems, the making of an arterial proximity between organisations could perhaps remedy a sometimes constraining proximity to the municipalities; one proximity developed to manage another. Yet, interpreting, foreseeing and imagining the boundaries of a new entity is an intricate task. In the meeting, the discussion had gradually shifted towards concerns about the merger, about what Swedes Included was actually about, what the core of who they were was, and how that could be affected by a merger. Thoughts about quality had opened to a discussion on how they interpreted and conveyed their results to others. "We need to show that we add to the big topic of societal change," someone said. Another one chimed in, "yeah, it's not about showing how great we are, but showing what we actually contribute to. But to do that we also need to get back to having a more personal contact". This seemed to resonate with Olivia. "I also feel like that", she said, "getting back to basics." Perhaps the final comment of the meeting, made by a team member just as time was running out, summed up the whole discussion: "so, how do we act if we're true to our conviction that the personal is important?"

As Garsten and Nyqvist (2013, p. 12) have it, boundaries "provide leads to what there is to protect – what is really at stake". It might seem that the issue of the merger, a possible re-boundering of Swedes Included, had elicited a somewhat protective response, in which the team was now looking for its essence, asking questions of what to retain in a merger, raising concerns about the loss of a core and stressing the value of the personal in their operations and interpretations of their work. To reconnect with Cohen (1985), what at first seemed to be more alike than different was perhaps beginning to be marked off as divergent; an inside being formulated, perhaps to aid in understanding what should be seen as, and kept, outside.

However, as much as such a suggestion of a boundering process might seem to make sense – the drawing of the differentiating line, the identification of a core – it might just as well be the result of seeing essence where one could instead see motion. Shifting from a perspective of boundedness to one of entwinement, Swedes Included's could instead be seen to have effected an inversion (Ingold, 2015) – to have spiralled in on themselves to the extent

that it appeared as if the intense discursive motion around a notion, that of the personal, was actually an identification of a core, an essence of who they were. It might be easy to confound what looks like a bounded entity – Swedes Included as a container of life (ibid), fencing off a possibly infectious merger relation – with the motion of an organism spiralling in on itself. As Ingold has it, to confuse the two would be "like confusing the curling movement of your hand in drawing a circle, and the trace it leaves, with the perimeter of the compleated figure" (ibid). While the drawn circle suggests a delimited boundedness, the orbiting movement of drawing it also generates a circle by the speed of its motion, a circle that by definition never is closed. And, indeed, a circle which, as a bounded entity, never exists. Which might also be the case with the core of an organisation, or the folding in on any phenomena or domain one would like to pin down.

Concluding the Chapter

In this chapter I have initiated the analytical contrasting of bounded and entwined sociality, moving from the metaphor of the door, which might indicate exchange but also positionality, to the metaphor of interlaced proximities and distances, as in Swedes Included's varying access to the municipalities' circulatory systems of decision making. I then moved further into the notion of entwined sociality, by exploring what might have been an almost arterial entanglement, in the possibility of a merger. This in turn led back to contrasting the bounded and the entwined, in approaching the notion of the personal as a core or as an inversion. As such, this chapter has suggested that what might appear as entities in an environment – people, organisations, or the notion of a core – might just as well be viewed as lines of life and motion, as people and organisations issuing forth (Ingold, 2011) in a domain of entanglement.

In the next chapter, focusing on the notion of entwined sociality and the domain of entanglement, I will delve deeper into the inversion of the personal, directing my curiosity towards the particularities of how that notion was made in practice, in the everydayness of Swedes Included's work.

2. The Core ‖ Knotting

"[K]notting is about how contrary forces of tension and friction, as in pulling tight, are generative of new forms. And it is about how forms are held in place within such a force-field or, in short, about 'making things stick'." (Ingold, 2015, p. 18)

While the previous chapter focused on the navigation and negotiation of proximities and distance that Swedes Included were engaged in with partners and collaborators, this chapter homes in on Swedes Included themselves. From tending to how inversions are spiralled up, I here tend to the motion of particular lines, to how they, in the words of Ingold (2015), coil around other lines and are coiled around in turn. In other words, here I tend to the particularities of *knotting*, to how more proximal and tension ridden bonds are made.

I will depart from the notion of *the personal*, formulated by Swedes Included in the meeting about the possible merger. As depicted in the previous chapter, the meeting ended with a team member asking: "So, how do we act if we're true to our conviction that the personal is important?" Concerns had been raised about losing their core as a result of going into productivity, as they phrased it, and they had stressed the importance of maintaining the personal contact throughout the process of their work. Or, as Olivia had phrased it, going back to basics. In the following I will try to trace this notion of the personal in Swedes Included's everyday practices, gently twisting the question they posed to instead ask: how could the personal, if so important, be seen to be made in the everydayness of Swedes Included's work? Keen to explore the personal by its less apparent traces, I will not engage with the obvious personal aspects of the friends'-first-meetups, the workshops or the social events, but instead focus on the administrative practices of matching friends and preparing for their first encounters.

Matching Friends

Back in December of 2016, during the day I spent with Swedes Included, the whole team had gathered to sum up the past year and draw some lines for the coming one. The issue of scaling was on the table. After the Swedish debate in 2015 about the so called migration crisis, both new and established Swedes were turning to Swedes Included in great numbers. As a result, they were looking for ways to keep up with the demand. As part of a larger issue of developing a digital platform meant to simplify and render more effective their

management of applications and the process of matching new friends, they were now exploring what in the actual process of matching that could be transferred into an algorithm. The operations manager at the time had set up an exercise to iron out the specifics. "Ok, let's think about our selection process", she said, "I'd like everyone to take a few post-it notes and write down what you think could be put into the algorithm, and what can't." Trying to make the task even clearer she added, "so, basically, what has to be part of the human interaction and what hasn't". One of the team members responded: "Well, age and gender and that kind of stuff can go there, but nothing else. I'm a great people person you know", she exclaimed jokingly, "I have an eye for what kind of people go well together. The algorithm can't do that." After a paus, still smiling, she added, "yeah yeah, I know, I can't decide on thousands of matches a year … but it just feels so … sad!"

When I followed Swedes Included again in 2017, the matching of friends was still made manually by the project leaders and interns, although with the support of a database where they had gathered information on their participants, from the interviews they did with new swedes, and from the surveys that established swedes filled out online. A number of parameters were specified there, such as age, gender, etc, but also interests, profession, and specific thoughts that the new or established swedes had expressed as things they might look for or wish for in a friend. The criteria for matching friends seemed to predominantly be based on an idea of similarity, such as being in the same age span, being from more or less the same area, sharing interests, and other contextual details. But no exact parameters were defined. Instead, the team member scanning through the database seemed rather free to think of possible matches. Having found two people they thought might make good friends, the team member would call them up, to tell them about the friend they were suggesting and ask if they'd like to meet. These calls were sometimes rather confused, as the language barrier could really take its toll, but mostly filled with laughter and anticipation. Such as one afternoon when the project leader Alicia hung up the phone and exclaimed, "how cool it is when everybody says yes!" The four of us that were in the room turned to her as she continued: "It's like they have the same aura", she said. "This is just going to be so great. And on top of everything, the mother of the established swede is also a dentist, just like the new swede!" She turned to Felicia, one of the interns, and said, making us all laugh, "it's that guy that was so good looking!"

The knotting was, as it seems, going on in various domains, not only in what the SFI-school principle Sofia compared to kinship-like ties between potential friends, but also

between the team and the friends they were matching, as well as between the team members themselves. While gathered around the table in their room, scanning the database and calling applicants, they were continuously exchanging information and impressions, on the potential viability of a match, a specific applicant they'd met, or how a phone call or a matching had turned out. The personal contact that one team member highlighted as important to maintain seemed to be something which not only happened in the team's contact with the applicants, but which was also very much present among the team members themselves, as they worked with the whole process of matching. Different from an algorithmic process, their matching seemed as a social and socialising process in itself. The sadness evoked by the digitalisation was perhaps not only that of a people-person having to give in to technology, but also a sadness of disentanglements within the team; losing proximity not only to the matching itself, but also to the sociality weaved across the team. Again, these proximities seemed to work in ways far less associated with boundedness and more with bundles of threads, where proximities would coil and knot, interlacing across domains, such as the individual and the organisational. With such an analogy, "there are no insides and outsides, only openings and ways through" (Ingold, 2007, p. 103) – the team members moved in "a zone in which their several paths are thoroughly entangled" (ibid), where administrative tasks were strongly interwoven with the individual, with the personal, and where proximities were complex and even contradictory at times.

Making Friends Meet

If we for a moment imagine Swedes Included's domain of entanglement as a wide and unfolding tapestry of social inclusion, how can we then imagine the personal to be woven into that fabric? The question has of course been addressed already in this chapter, but I pose it here to underline a shift of attention, from the processes of matching new and established swedes, to the processes of actually making them meet. In the particularities of that administration, many of the knots of the personal seemed to be made.

One Wednesday in December, Felicia was taking care of the administrative preparations for that evenings friends'-first-meetup. She seemed to spend most of the afternoon glued to her phone, either texting or talking. Several people had cancelled on the event, and for some it wasn't the first time they had done so. The new friends themselves had no contact with each other before the evening of the first meet-up, so for each cancellation that Felicia

received she would in her turn have to call that participant's friend-to-be to cancel on them. She would then try to reach the participant that had cancelled to establish a new possible Wednesday that would work for both, having checked their availability. She would also try to get an idea of whether rescheduling was the best option or if there was any reason to also consider a new match to be made. Some participants might have gotten doubts about their suggested friend, or were simply not committed to, or available for, making the encounter happen within the next few weeks. Having found a new Wednesday that worked for both, which usually was the case, Felicia would inform them again about place and time through a text message, and ask them to confirm with a simple OK. For this evening, seven matches had been cancelled, but fourteen were confirmed, and a number were still pending.

A few days later Felicia was having another meet-up, but this time at Swedes Included's office. Although first meet-ups usually happened on Wednesdays, separate ones were also arranged to accommodate agendas, usually with a smaller number of participants. I overheard her talking on the phone to one of the participants, explaining how to get to the metro station nearby, and then from there to the office. It was obvious that there was a language barrier in their exchange. "No no, first you take the metro to Raven Street … yes, Raven Street". After some additional explaining she got off the phone. "I really hope she finds her way", she said, laughing a little, but also looking rather concerned. Sometimes they'd go and fetch people themselves from the metro, she said, when it got too hard to describe the way. "I might just have to do that tonight." The woman she had been talking to had never been to the city centre and was very unfamiliar with the whole metro system. And furthermore, the credit on her phone was out, so Felicia could call her, but she could not call Felicia if she got lost. I left the room for a while and when I got back Felicia seemed even more distressed. "Now she's not answering her phone!"

Getting back to the image I opened this section with, of Swedes Included's domain of entanglement as a wide and unfolding tapestry of social inclusion, how can we then imagine the importance of the personal to be woven into that fabric? Perhaps the intricate handwork of tapestry making can be alluded to the time consuming labour of calling, texting, interviewing, populating databases, guiding participants … all the ways in which the team was practically administrating the process of matching and making the new friends meet. As it seemed, the weft of personal contact was intricately woven into many of these practices. Through the unformalized process of finding suitable matches, where team members would exchange ample information face-to-face, each participant in the friendship program seemed

to gradually become more than just a name to them. Especially in the interviews made with the new swedes, many touching life stories were often shared, filled with specificities on the challenges these individuals, many of them refugees, had faced in getting to where they were now. And although that information was not available in the databases, the impressions and emotions that team members carried from these interviews could later be cautiously shared around the table, as the database searching, matching, and calling was underway.

But to refine and deepen this reflection, I will turn to a participant experience of administration I had myself, where, in stark contrast to the entanglements of the team, the threads of the personal would seem utterly absent.

And oh, the woman who's phone credit was out, she made to the office.

Unknotted Participation

I was helping out with administering the attendance to one of Swedes Included's social events. Vera had presented me with two excel-files, one listing participants and another listing volunteers, and instructed me how to go about the task. The first step was to get an update on everyone's status of participation. As I would be communicating with both participants and volunteers mainly through text messages, I would first get everyone's contacts transferred from the excel-files to a smartphone that Vera had provided me with. It was tedious work, to say the least. After having copy-pasted the data from computer to phone in various steps, I was finally ready to put it all in the receiver field of two separate text messages, one for the participants and one for the volunteers, and send out the information about the event, with a request that they confirm their attendance. Within a few minutes the first answers started to drop in. I would make a note in the excel-file for the event, of who had answered what, and respond to any additional questions that someone might have. Around two o'clock in the afternoon I compiled a list of participants and volunteers that would participate and sent it in an email to the volunteer in charge.

The cumbersomeness of the process was overwhelming and I was amazed by the amount of time it had taken to just sort out the attendance to a single event. I was of course new to the procedure, but sharing my experience with the team they all seemed to relate, as the administration of the weekly friends'-first-meetups was basically the same. Yet, however overwhelmingly boring the work had been for me, it also made me reflect on administrative work without social coiling. The team members did indeed agree with the tediousness of the

task, but, I would argue, the difference between our experiences lied in how the names I was administering did not, to me, have any relationships or personal contact weaved into them. As I coiled a name-thread around the receiver field of the text message application, that thread had never coiled around or knotted with me.

What's knotted, Ingold (2015) suggests, it not joined *up*, but joined *with*. To be joined up would imply a finality contradicted by the ongoing life of things. Being joined with, what's knotted is tangled in a generative motion where the threads of the knot, without losing their particularity in the intimacy of their embrace, mingle in ways that defy mere juxtaposition. I had not been directly involved in interviewing or calling participants, and there were no threads for me to coil with 'by proxy', no personal contact with participants to analogously use when administering participants that were unknown to me. But for the team members, I argue, in the daily and socially imbued administering of the matching and the meeting of new friends, there was a real possibility of a proximal experience, almost arterial if you will, that could also be weaved into the notion of a core.

At the end of the meeting on the merger, as depicted in chapter one, a team member asked the question of how to act if they'd be true to their conviction that the personal was important. Slightly twisting that question, to instead ask how the personal, if so important, could be seen to be made, I set out to trace it in the everydayness of Swedes Included's work. So, how do the intricacies of administrative coiling matter to how the personal is made? By indicating, I suggest, how the notion of the personal emerged not only from trying to identify effective ways for Swedes Included to reach their goals, and not only from possibly protective responses to a sense of losing their core in the process of a merger, but from the very proximal sociality, with participants as well as within the team, that was thickly weaved into their practices.

Centre of Attention

Lacking a sense of the personal in my administrative experience, I also seemed to lack an entanglement with the core that Swedes Included had formulated. I had entangled with Swedes Included in different ways, but their participants remained to me, as became clear, like loose threads. If entwined sociality could be thought of as threads more or less entangled, knots imbued with more or less tension, then belongingness could perhaps be thoughts of as the extent to which one is entangled with not just any knots, but with knots of pertinent

tension. The personal, then, would not be a core, but, I suggest, a knottedness at the *centre of attention*. Such a metaphor could perhaps be seen to splinter off the notion of the personal as a core into actually portraying it as a swirling up of the most widespread of threads, the most woven of lines.

My administrative experience was one where I and the team could resonate with regards to the cumbersomeness of the process, at least, but where I could not resonate with their notion of the personal; the sociality that ran through their tending to administration was beyond my capacity of weaving – I lacked the threads. As such, the notion of the personal marked Swedes Included off from me, just as it marked them off from Agency for Inclusion at the meeting of the merger. And what, in terms of belongingness, as a participant or in a possible merger, could be seen as a boundary not available for crossing, might instead be thought of as a scarcity of lines, as a lack of entanglement with the knots of pertinent tension, with the knottedness at the centre of attention.

Concluding the Chapter

In this chapter, homing in on the particularities of knotting, I have explored how a notion identified as a core could instead be seen as a notion thickly weaved into the fabric of an organisation. Tracing the personal in Swedes Included's everyday work, exploring attempts of digitalising the matching of friends, the administration of making friends meet, as well as my own participatory experience of administering a social event, I have argued that these practices were strongly interlaced with the threads of personal contact. And I have suggested that the personal, formulated in the meeting about a possible merger, perhaps was not so much a result of drawing boundaries around an organisation, as it was a matter of bringing to the centre of attention one of Swedes Included's most knotted lines, and experiencing that it didn't seem to tangle with the other organisation.

But what if a core would suddenly seem split? With the metaphor of threaded belonging, such a rupture would not be one of cleaving, but rather of unthreading the most woven of lines, imagined to permeate everything. To me, such a metaphor opens for a drastically different possibility of thinking with the particularities, practical and emotional, of having to redefine one's understanding of what one is, as an organism, as an organisation. That unthreading is the focus of the next chapter.

3. The Split ‖ In-between

> "Indeed there would be good grounds for supposing that in clinging – or, more prosaically, in holding on to one another – lies the very essence of sociality: a sociality, of course, that is in no wise limited to the human but extends across the entire panoply of clingers and those to whom, or that to which, they cling. But what happens when people or things cling to one another? There is an entwining of lines. They must bind in some such way that the tension that would tear them apart actually holds them fast. Nothing can hold on unless it puts out a line, and unless that line can tangle with others." (Ingold, 2015, p. 3)

A notion perceived to describe the core of an organisation could perhaps readily be thought of as quite stable. And losing it might imply that what was, in its essence no longer is. But understood as an inversion (Ingold, 2015), or a centre of attention as I suggested in the previous chapter, a different frailty is suddenly introduced to the seeming stability. A redistribution of tension throughout a knotted coherence might gradually or unexpectedly imbue other knots with attention. And who is to say that, because of that redistribution of tension, the organisation is no longer of the same fabric?

I continue here, as I've done in previous chapters, to contrast notions of bounded and entwined sociality, but this time in relation to change, to that which unfolds in time. While the first two chapters, from the perspective of boundedness, in different ways dealt with differentiation – the idea of the environment which assumes an entity to surround, the idea of the core of something which assumes an essence – this third chapter, from the same perspective, deals with discontinuation and rupture. In the realm of the bounded, The Core of the former chapter alluded to the making of an essence, while The Split of this chapter alludes to a breaking of that which has been seen as a whole, or as a core. In the realm of the bounded, the split of a core can be a matter of creation or devastation, as with the replication of DNA, or the release of the energy of an atom – something which is bounded is cleaved and alters its relation to its environment, transitioning from one state to another.

In the domain of entanglement things are perhaps less dramatic, at least in the sense of transitions, as the notion of transitioning does not really apply. Instead, what happens in the domain of entanglement has been going on and is continuous – knots are tied and untied, inversions made and unmade. Thus, from a perspective of lines, this chapter deals with disentanglement, with the untying of knots, the undoing of inversion – and of course, with the new entanglements that go on simultaneously. The drama of change in the domain of entanglement lies not in transitions, but in what I would describe as the *experiential proximity*

to (dis)entanglement – such as the emotionality it might bring; the memories it might evoke; the hopes of future entanglements it might give rise to; the bewilderment it might provoke while still reaching out with new lines to tangle with. The domain of entanglement is, as I see it, one of attentiveness and proximity to the unfolding. It's a domain where change, rather than being understood as transitional, as a movement from an initial to a final state, and thus happening *between*, is understood as continuous, proximal, unfolding, and thus happening *in-between*, without beginning or end.

In Ingold's words: "*Where between is liminal, in-between is arterial; where between is intermediate, in-between is midstream*" (Ingold, 2015, p. 147, italics in original). In this chapter I will continue to follow Swedes Included from a perspective of, as Ingold would have it, the arterial and the midstream, but with focus on how forces, that in chapter two were explored as what holds them fast, here are explored as what potentially could tear them apart.

Untying Knots, Weaving Emotionality

A few days before the scenarios workshop depicted in the beginning of this thesis, Roya and Olivia where having a meeting to catch up, just the two of them. It rarely happened, they said, usually they'd just bounce things off of each other on the fly, between meetings or whenever they got the opportunity. My presence in any meeting was almost a given by then, towards the end of my fieldwork, and I would usually just join without paying too much attention to my position in the room. At this meeting I however deliberately placed myself a bit down the table, just a few chairs away, to give them the sense of privacy I assumed they needed.

Beginning the meeting they spent a few minutes on some operational matters, but soon shifted to discussing the essentials – the strained financial situation they knew they had to communicate to the team within a few days, the hiring of the CEO, and the possible layoff of Vera. They exchanged some half-hearted jokes about how to evade the layoff, on where to turn to get the money they needed. Lacking answers they soon moved back to practicalities, diving into todo lists, tending to salary payments and economic reporting, emailing some municipalities that were lagging behind on confirming their partnership for the coming year. They occasionally looked up to exchange some information, but mostly just stayed submerged in their computers, briefly bouncing some issues back and forth with their eyes still locked on their screens.

Some twenty minutes later their exchanges started touching on the essentials again. As it

began taking over the conversation they finally put their computers aside and focused on each other instead. Roya sighed. "I hate this. I don't want her to go." For a short while they just sat there. Then they reviewed the formalities of the layoff again, as they'd done many times the last few weeks – the amount they would need to continue without changes, the exit-order for the personnel according to the labour laws. They talked about Vera and the others in the team, how much they liked them, how much each of them added to Swedes Included. Soon they were imagining more layoffs, if some pending applications for funding would turn out to their disadvantage. "Imagine we'd have to let go of two or even three", Roya said, "it would look crazy to have a management that is almost as big as the number of project leaders. And it wouldn't make sense that I would manage so few. I don't know if I could justify that. I'd either have to become more operational myself, and I don't want that, or I'd have to step out. Having this role cannot be more important than the organisation."

Thinking with lines (Ingold, 2007, 2011, 2015) is helpful as it allows for a very proximal attention to change, to that which unfolds in time. It directs attention to traces of movement and helps in getting away from notions of problems and solutions, and rather move in close to the *ambiguities* of interlacing. As with Roya and Olivia, who had a knot to untie, a friend to lay off, as well as a team to inform about the changes. It's ambiguous, because the knot that was their entanglement with Vera was one of pleasure for them, of friendship and trust, yet the attention they had to pay to it was one of unlacing, where proximity would lead to distance. Their undoing was a practical and proximal commitment to disbanding that which they wished they could rather retain. As it were, and as I expand on below, in protecting, applying and advancing their intention for social change, Roya and Olivia would also get enlaced in measures that really hurt.

Listening to their conversation, I perceived them to be spiralling down into ever darker and more painful imaginaries of their future. I sat there in silence, feeling my own body fill up with sadness and a sense of immobility. Roya was continuing to express in different ways the priority of Swedes Included to exist and grow, rather than her having to be part of the organisation, and it was apparent that a tension was building up in her. Soon she burst into tears, and quickly got up to close the curtains to the conference room. When she had sat down again, Olivia spoke for the first time in quite a while. "Roya, I need to ask, because I need to understand", she said, "are you saying that you actually want to do something else? Is this an opportunity to take that step, and that's what you're actually saying?" I was suddenly very aware of what seemed as Olivia's rather composed manner, her straightforward but bated

way of asking her questions, in stark contrast to Roya's agitation. Roya assured her that she didn't want to quit, that her concern was for the organisation. Olivia asked her again a few times, her same questions, before she seemed to settle with Roya's response.

To actually start pulling the threads of a knot which one does not want to untie can perhaps set off an apprehension about the tenability of other knots which seem to be associated with it. It's as if, reluctantly tending to untying one knot, Roya and Olivia were beginning to imagine the tear-up of a whole knit work. With such an imaginary weaving itself into their domain of entanglement, other knots seemed to suddenly get imbued with immediacy; things that a moment ago were of no concern, suddenly appeared as if all at risk. As it seemed, the apprehensive attention to one knot would cause an increase in proximity also to those other knots, as they were alarmingly brought into awareness – a distributed proximity and an increase in tension throughout the meshwork, throughout the "tissue of trails that together comprise the texture of the lifeworld" (Ingold, 2011, p. 70). Yet, I would argue, that alarmed proximity would also be one imbued with distance, as Roya's and Olivia's attention to many of those knots was one of spiralling apprehensive imaginaries, of assumed vulnerabilities. Thus, proximation and distancing occurring at the same time, actually co-existing in a single occurrence or "moment of ongoing activity" (Ingold, 2007, p. 90), entangled yet particular.

When putting their computers aside and really starting to engage with the question of the layoff, Roya and Olivia also seemed to allow for a proximity to their emotions. As with the sadness in the process of digitalisation, depicted in chapter two, the threads of emotionality also became visible; their fear of losing even more employees, Roya's concern about an oversized management and the conflictual role-prioritisations it gave rise to, Olivia's concern that Roya was perhaps speaking in codes, and actually was communicating a desire to herself disentangle. The many particularities of these threads, I suggest, became available to Roya and Olivia only by their actual engagement with the motion in the knot in which these threads were interlaced. Tending to it as something which was in tension, and thus in continuous motion, they came in contact with various aspects of that which it moved, of that which was tied into it. And, as a result, they were themselves moved. Emotionally, but also in their continuous interpretation of that which they engaged with. In other words, the tending to that knot was not an exercise of distanced manipulation, where the knot lied before them and they'd undo it, at arm's length. It was rather an engagement with a thing in motion which itself changed, and changed them, as its threads were pulled – threads appeared which were

not visible at first and new threads were introduced. Referring back to Vigh (2007, 2009) and his notion of social navigation: an entwined depiction of motion within motion, of motion squared.

But, if the untying of a beloved knot could threaten, imagined or real, to undo a whole knit work, what then could uphold the coherence of an organisation, if it could not confide in the encompassing safety of the boundary to contain it? Other knots, perhaps?

Knotted Coherence

Roya looked at me with a smile through her tears. "This is so awkward, I'm really sorry", she said. And I can't really say if it was the psychologist in me that reacted, addressing distress, or the anthropologist, the participant observer realising that the only thing awkward in this situation was the presence of a third person potentially acting as if not partaking in the emotional and relational acuteness of the situation. "There's nothing awkward about your tears", I said, "you're both under a huge amount of pressure, and you really need each other right now to manage the vulnerability and the loneliness in that." They both laughed a little and confirmed to each other the strain they were feeling.

Perhaps the well-intended distance of my position in the room became an anomaly in the emotionality of the situation. And perhaps, as a response to that, Roya extended a line that allowed us to knot, suspending the remaining relational distance in the room. What Roya did, I suggest, was akin to that which Olivia did, when repeatedly asking Roya about her true desires to leave or remain in the organisation – they both extended lines from places of distress, from an experience of disentanglement or incoherence. As Ingold has it, "[t]o hang in there it is necessary to put out a line, and to let it correspond with others" (Ingold, 2015, p. 156). Roya and Olivia seemed to be spiralling down into ever darker imaginaries of the future, with the risk of perhaps losing grip of actualities. To hang in there they extended lines, to each other, to me, to things that could counteract a sense of disbandment; perhaps I also had to be weaved in for the situation to settle. But apart from new lines being introduced to settle the situation, perhaps the lines of the existing knots also needed to be pulled to test their steadfastness. And, in doing so, they were imbued again with attention, or at-tension; the one pulling was there, at the knot, tending to it. As Olivia, when pulling and testing the knots that were Roya's entanglement with Swedes Included. And while that happened, they were seemingly brought out of an imaginary state, where the risk of their immediate and complete

disentanglement had become an assumed but unverified reality, and instead brought into an attentive awareness, to that which was actually unfolding. Or, in Ingold's (2015) words, into correspondence, into answering and being answered to.

Conveying his notion of correspondence Ingold repeatedly returns to Marcel Mauss' Essay on the Gift from 1925, to the interpenetration that occurs in the exchange of the gift: "Through the gift, my awareness penetrates yours – I am *with* you in your thoughts – and in your counter-gift, you are *with* me in mine. And so long as we continue to give and receive, this interpenetration can carry on or perdure" (ibid, p. 10-11, italics in original). The revolutionary contribution of Mauss, Ingold argues, was that he established "the possibility of selves to interpenetrate, to mingle" (Gatt & Ingold, 2013, p. 142), or more precisely, that Mauss succeeded in demonstrating "the possibility of interpenetration as a *durable condition*" (Ingold, 2015, p. 10, my italics). As a result, Ingold suggests, seeing the behaviour of humans and groups becomes less like looking at entities, either isolated or congregated, aggregated or fused, and more, as suggested by Mauss, like "observing octopuses and anemones in the sea" (Gatt & Ingold, 2013, p. 142).

Coherence, from this perspective, is not a matter of boundedness, of regularity or consistency. Rather, as Ingold suggests, "in a world where things are continually coming into being through processes of growth and movement – that is, in a world of *life* – knotting is the fundamental principle of coherence" (Ingold, 2015, p. 14, italics in original). From a perspective of boundedness, coherence implies a connectedness by uniformity, a boundering of that which is assumed to fit together – as with the statistical scatter plot, where the data points that create proximity can be circled in and conceptualised, based on similarity, on a logic of co-variance. There, proximity is understood as alikeness, distance as difference. But in a knotted coherence, proximity and distance can be interlaces in the same knot, distributed asymmetrically – what seems to be distant can be proximate in tension. Ambiguity does not become a contradiction to conceptualisation. The durability of the knotted coherence does not rely on a boundary that differentiates it from its environment, but on the correspondence and the tension-ridden feel for one another (Ingold, 2015) that runs through it. As such, I suggest, it also allows for a multiplicity, diversity and experiential proximity in the understanding of change, of that which unfolds in time – noticing the tension in the attending to, the revealing of unnoticed threads, as well as the weaving of new ones, as one is engaging with motion.

But relating back to the outset of this chapter and the splitting of a core, how can this

notion of knotted coherence be helpful in thinking about inversions? By tending to, I suggest, how they come out of their spin.

Undoing Inversions

At the scenarios workshop, depicted at the very beginning of this thesis, Roya suddenly came to a decision – she was going to stop referring to the coming CEO by name, until he was in place, and she was going to stop talking about the layoff as being about Vera, instead referring to it as having to let go of a project leader. "It all gets so personal", she said, "as if it was about the individuals." The merger meeting, in which the notion of the personal as a core had surfaced, had taken place about five weeks earlier. Between then and the scenarios workshop, the hiring of the CEO had been discussed at various occasions, both in formal meetings and in informal talks between members of the team. The possible layoff of Vera was however a topic known only to Roya, Olivia and their strategic advisor. The breaking of that news laid two days ahead of the scenarios workshop, in a meeting where Roya and Olivia would share the financial overview with the team. The scenarios workshop had come about as a preparation for that meeting, as an opportunity for Roya and Olivia to sort out their imaginaries about how it would unfold. As the depiction of the workshop conveys, they had themselves heavily entangled the hiring of the CEO with the layoff of Vera. Consequently, they explored scenarios based on the different options of having or not having each of them on board, as if the matter was about having to choose between individuals. Roya's comment indicated a change in discourse, away from the personal.

The notion of the personal had emerged as a centre of attention, and had also come to my attention, with the meeting on the possible merger. Not because of the possibilities that the merger could afford, but because of the concerns raised by the team that "by moving into productivity we'll also lose the core of what we are". Although the personal, as I suggest in chapter two, was well weaved into their practices, it seemed to emerge as a shared and formal formulation of a core only when the organisation was at a point of perhaps ceasing to exist as they knew it. From a perspective of lines there was of course no core as such to begin with, but rather a notion imbued with attention – a notion which the team had spiralled in on, effecting an inversion (Ingold, 2015), creating a sense of boundedness around it, formulating it as a core. Towards the end of my fieldwork, the inversion of the personal seemed to be coming out of its swirl.

Concluding the Chapter

In this chapter, homing in on the discontinuation and rupture of an assumed core, I have argued that a view of sociality as entwined might afford a far more complex understanding of the motion within motion (Vigh, 2007, 2009) of change, of that which unfolds in time. With the knot in focus, and with knotted coherence as a means of sustaining motion, I have explored how a tension which could be thought to tear Swedes Included apart actually might be seen to hold them fast, as their tending to knots of distress would also afford the possibility of new forms (Ingold, 2015) – with the seeming undoing of the inversion of the personal, a redistribution of attention might give rise to new centres of attention. And while the tapestry of their organisational life might seem to become another, the threads that weave their fabric could perhaps still be seen as the same, and still be called Swedes Included.

4. Scale ‖ Motion

> "Scalability is, indeed, a triumph of precision design, not just in computers but in business, development, the 'conquest' of nature, and, more generally, world making. It is a form of design that has a long history of dividing winners and losers. Yet it disguises such divisions by blocking our ability to notice the heterogeneity of the world; by its design, scalability allows us to see only uniform blocks, ready for further expansion." (Tsing, 2012, p. 505)

Chapter one explored the complexity of proximities and distances that were made as both Swedes Included and their partners tried to relate to how, and if, they should cling to one another. This chapter also focuses on the domain of social entrepreneurship, but homes in on the politics of motion, and of wanting to fulfil one's vision in a complex dynamic of dependencies and opportunities. Building on the ethnography in previous chapters, as well as on a final and more elaborate interview I got to do with Roya and Olivia just before concluding my fieldwork in early February of 2018, this chapter will be more conceptual and theoretical than the previous ones, pulling threads together to convey a tapestry of sorts, and eventually suggesting a conceptualisation of Swedes Included based on their motion, rather than on their ascribed affiliation to a field.

As part of the domain of social entrepreneurship, Swedes Included were, as previously mentioned, in partnership with various incubators, such as Incorporation Advocates, which at an early stage had identified Swedes Included as social entrepreneurs and taken them on to their strategic advisory program. These incubators would strive, by means of strategic and operational advice, and sometimes funds, to help organisations with a social aim to *scale up*, not only in terms of size, but also in terms of their social impact, as well as in terms of possibly becoming economically self-sustaining, rather than depending on financial help from, for example, foundations, philanthropists or the incubators themselves. In everything that Swedes Included did – discussing a possible merger or the hiring of a CEO, relating to partners and municipalities, trying to automatize their friend-matching process or the administration of events, and any other strategic and operational matter – they would seem to relate to these expectations of scaling and increasing their impact, held not only by the incubators but also by Swedes Included themselves.

Nina Dudnik (2010) suggests that when starting any kind of venture, scalability and sustainability are key concerns, but that for organisations with a social aim, these concepts become even more complicated. Scalability, she says, is no longer a matter of increasing

revenue while the marginal costs decrease with each unit sale, but a search for solutions that can be replicated, perhaps still with high demands of personnel, but consistent in their impact in every new place. And sustainability, she continues, is not only about the longevity of the organisation, preferably surviving without continuous economic contributions from investors or other non-operational funding, but also about the durability of the social benefit provided, of an impact that is not dependent on the continuous presence of the social entrepreneur.

In the following I will explore these challenges in relation to the future imaginaries and the everyday navigation of Swedes Included.

Carving and Cleaving Worlds

Stability and Expansion

As I noted in the beginning of this thesis, I seemed to meet Swedes Included at a point where their everydayness had opened up to indeterminacy. They seemed to be asking themselves how to carry on, with what, and even *as* what. In the final interview Roya and Olivia we would talk about their imaginaries of the future, and they would elaborate on variations of scale and impact, moving between the small and the big, the personal and the corporate, and on means that could increase the effect of their efforts. Their accounts would span from the effect of the specific friendship encounter, possibly spreading a change of attitudes towards other people like ripple effects across society, to the necessity of establishing a large organisation, independent from the unpredictability of the municipality contracts, and having the financial and organisational means to address the general public without intermediaries. They would hypothesise doing as other non-profit organisations had done and find alternative revenue streams, selling training programs, lectures, or even products. They could function as a limited company, they said, or, quite contrary, develop a member-based organisation, where members would have a saying and be part of shaping their path. They could remain a small organisation, reaching only those already committed, affecting individuals but not society at large. Or be big one, like IKEA as one of them said, and have an impact on the whole country, such as IKEA had affected most Swedish homes.

To scale, Carr and Lempert (2016) suggest, is a process of carving and cleaving worlds, of organising, interpreting, orienting and acting in the world. It is not simply "to assume or assert 'bigness' or 'smallness' by way of a ready-made calculus" (ibid, p. 3), but to engage with language and practices, in an "inherently relational and comparative endeavour" (ibid)

of differentiation and distinctions. Such as Olivia and Roya seeing societal transformation in the ripple effects of individual encounters. Or in analogously exploring the dream of an impact the size of IKEA. In terms of scaling, IKEA would seem to very well exemplify what Anna Tsing (2012) describes as "the ability to expand without rethinking basic elements" (ibid, p. 505). Such scaling, as she suggests in the quote that opened this section, relies on a conceptualisation of the scalable as uniform blocks, as well as on precision and stability – practices, measures, and conceptualisations need to be coherent and consistent, in order to be replicated on a larger scale. Although IKEA was perhaps more a figure of speech than an actual ideal, Roya and Olivia seemed to be highly engaged in trying to establish a stability from which to expand. As such, their practices of protecting, applying and advancing an intention for social change seemed to be tightly linked with thoughts about scaling and increasing their social impact. As practices of imagining and trying to make a future come true, they could also be seen as practices of hope, with hope understood as a wish for something to come true by action (Swedberg, 2017; Genda, 2017), not aimed at something abstract but at something precise, with "a goal to which it points" (Swedberg, 2017, p. 44).

Hiring a CEO would seem as such a practice of hope, aimed at enhancing their sustainability (Dubnik, 2010), in various ways. "We need to go from being an organisation which is dependent on its two founders, to being an organisation that hopefully within six months is not", as Roya said in our final interview. "We talk a lot about how we hope that hiring Christer will also bring a professionalisation to the organisation", she added. "Today it's all quite personal and private, and in the personal the focus becomes too much on the individual rather than on the needs of the organisation." Lingering on the matter of independence, Roya would exclaim, in a moment of frustration: "we need to become independent of societal and political changes, because this is about the people!" Although perhaps a somewhat irrational plea of sovereignty, the comment could also be seen to suggest a wish for having a stability from which to relate to the world and render it legible, manageable, foreseeable – to perhaps be in the position of setting the parameters of motion, rather than having to move by those dictated by others.

Dependencies and Political Agency

The Danish anthropologist Henrik Vigh speaks of two different actualisations of political agency, in which individuals or groups can be seen to engage in either "a sedentary act of

creating a domain", or in "a migratory act of creating trajectories" (Vigh, 2007, p. 132). The differentiation he refers to is one theorised by Michel de Certeau (1984) in which he distinguishes between practices of strategy and tactics. A strategy, de Certeau contends, is a calculation or manipulation of power relations which aims to, first of all, demarcate its own place of power and will. It relies on establishing a space which can serve as a base from where to manage "an exteriority composed of targets or threats" (ibid, p. 36). In Vigh's words, "a space from where to institutionalise and impose [our] own understanding of the world" (Vigh, 2007, p. 132). A tactic, in contrast, rather than a calculation of power relations, is described by de Certeau (1984) as a calculated *action*, a motion by seized opportunities, a resistance if you will, determined by the absence of a demarcated space and base to act from. In Vigh's words, a means of acting politically "by navigating the spaces of others to our advantage" (Vigh, 2007, p. 132). By lacking its own space, and by lacking a view of the whole, a limitation which Roya and Olivia were keen on remedying with the hiring of the CEO, "a tactic is determined by the *absence of power* just as a strategy is organized by the postulation of power" (de Certeau, 1984, p. 38, italics in original). In short, de Certeau says, "a tactic is an art of the weak" (ibid, p. 37).

Again, as Vigh (2007) suggested above, practices of strategy and tactics are ideal types of political agency. For the tactics, he says, lacking the power to demarcate a space of their will, "the option is not passivity or resignation, but is instead tactical manoeuvring or navigation" (Vigh, 2007, p. 134). The emphasis in de Certeau's quote should perhaps, as I understand Vigh, be on the art rather than on the weakness. While strategy is an act of setting, enforcing and reinforcing rules, tactics, Vigh says, "are actions directed at making the best of them, using and bending them" (Vigh, 2007, p. 135). In other words, to simply regard Swedes Included as weak due to the limitedness imposed on them by the space-making of others, would be to carve and cleave their world too roughly. Yet, in Roya's and Olivia's strivings to establish stability and independence for Swedes Included, their ambitions for social change could also be seen as highly disproportionate to their ability to exercise their will. Thus, although striving to create a base from which to act more independently, and even in a moment of frustration dreaming of a place of impenetrable power from which to serve the people, Swedes Included were seemingly to a large extent left to the momentary seizing of opportunities presented to the tactic, forced to relate to the demarcated spaces established by those with the possibility and ability to do so – advisors, incubators, philanthropists, municipalities, and others.

A pragmatic manoeuvring, if you will, which could also be said about how Roya and Olivia related to the very definition of themselves as social entrepreneurs. "Although we don't call ourselves that", Roya said in our final interview, "we have always been called so by others". Olivia agreed and added, "because some partners we have are active in that sector and want to push for social entrepreneurship in Sweden and Scandinavia". Thus, in de Certeau's terms, Roya and Olivia could be seen as tactics also in this regard, navigating the spaces of others to their own advantage, as Vigh (2007) would have it. But different from their attempts to establish a stability and independence for the organisation, their reluctance to embrace the identity of the social entrepreneur seemed more as a complying unwillingness – being called so was tolerable albeit not integrable. While they in their striving for independence were wishing to break free, they were perhaps, with regards to the labelling as social entrepreneurs, rather engaging in "the subtle, stubborn, resistant activity of groups which, since they lack their own space, have to get along in a network of already established forces and representations" (de Certeau, 1984, p. 18).

Winners and Losers

In Swedes Included's pragmatic resistance it's hard perhaps, as Tsing (2012) does in the quote that opened this section, to speak of winners and losers, dividing the strong from the weak, those in power from those without, even differentiating the assumedly free from the confined and restricted. Thus, rather than carving and cleaving power dynamics by uniform blocks, we might instead tend to the particularities of issuing forth in the world – the coiling, weaving and knotting. And we can do so, I believe, recognising the variability and ambiguity of power relations, without neglecting the precarity and the vulnerability of those trying to live and get ahead in worlds that others have made. This, as I understand it, is the heterogeneity which Tsing refers to as being blocked by the precision design of scalability, and its resulting division of winners and losers.

Tsing's account is one of scalability as a modernist dream of expansion, where bigger was better, both in business and development. It was a dream that relied on precision, as the frame and the elements of the project needed to remain unaltered in the production of growth. To achieve this, production was relieved of its social elements. Relationships, Tsing contends, being encounters across difference, have a quality of indeterminacy and a capacity to produce new agendas. As such, they carry the potential of transformation, a direct threat to the nested

scales, neatly coupled up from small to large, that characterise the modernist dream of expansion. According to Tsing, the same can be said about most modern science, where parsing stable data elements becomes key to not messing up the research frame and its expandability. As a potential result, the kind of knowledge produced within such frames, as on social entrepreneurship I might suggest, whether in academia or elsewhere, cannot see the non-scalable, "because of the constitutive scalability of its own practices" (ibid, p. 522). What is occluded or blocked from sight is "the wild diversity of life on earth" (ibid, p. 505), the heterogeneity that in the eyes of scalability is a recipe for failure. Scalability projects, Tsing says, "banish meaningful diversity, which is to say, diversity that might change things" (ibid, p. 507). But, as Tsing has it, the project of scalability was also successful in occluding the insufficiencies of its own practices. For, as she specifically stresses, scalability is never complete: "If the world is still diverse and dynamic, it is because scalability never fulfils its own promises" (ibid, p. 510). Carving and cleaving winners and losers in the force-relations of space-making and tactical pragmatism might, in other words, prove to be hard, and honestly not very helpful, if the aim is rather to see, sometimes all entangled within a single organisation, the heterogeneity in a domain of social entrepreneurship, the wild diversity of intentions for social change and imaginaries about how to go through with them. Going beyond the uniformity of scalability, a pragmatic tactic of calculated action might instead be seen, and with that a greater diversity within the domain of social entrepreneurship. That is not to deny the existence of a demarcated space, real not least in its strategic consequences. Instead, it is to see dependencies and opportunities, or power relations, as tangled threads in an entwined sociality, rather than positions in a bounded one.

Carriership of Intention – A Concept to Think With

Throughout this thesis I have been quite stubborn about challenging bounded notions of social entrepreneurship, instead trying to infuse the domain with a number of boundary rejecting concepts. Based on my fieldwork material, I here suggest a notion of my own, that of *carriership of intention*, in an attempt to convey something about the particularities of Swedes Included reality, and in possibly opening up for a concept to think with, beyond the constraints of my fieldwork and this thesis. It's a little inversion of my own, if you will, but one hopefully exposed to the ambiguity of a knotted coherence, to the tension-ridden (dis)entanglements of sociality.

As I've elaborated on, while Swedes Included were navigating a space of social entrepreneurship, and were regarded by many in that domain to be social entrepreneurs, their own engagements with having their intentions come true were not conceptualised by themselves within that frame, neither as self-characterisation nor in their elaboration on imaginaries of possible futures. Their relation to being called social entrepreneurs was a pragmatic one, and the futures they elaborated on would span from a member based non-profit association to the possibility of actually managing the organisation as a limited company. Thus, while entangling with others in and around that domain, they were also tactically adhering to denominations and expectations directed at them within it. What however seemed to remain unaffected by both identificatory labels and their explorations of organisational figurations, was, as suggested before, their intention, that which they were reaching for and wanted to achieve.

Their considerations, in discourse as well as practice, of how to persevere in their attempts of making their intention come true, of how to protect, apply and advance their intention, is what I refer to as carriership. The notion of carriership of intention is less about how Swedes Included conceptualise or make sense of their intention, and more about the practices of carrying it through. Thus, to approach Swedes Included as carriers of intention, rather than as social entrepreneurs, is, I suggest, to approach them by their actual motion and practice. Referring to de Certeau (1984), it is to approach them from their own tactical horizon, rather than from the demarcated space of social entrepreneurship.

Vigh (2007), whom I referred to above discussing de Certeau, develops the notion of social navigation. Contrasting it to Micheal Jackson's notion of manoeuvring, which Vigh describes as "the immediate – or short term – practical engagement with the forces that move us and move around us." (Vigh, 2009, p. 425), he suggests that navigation expands that notion by relating to "movement through both the socially *immediate* and the socially *imagined*" (ibid, p. 425, italics in original). As such, "it encompasses a denser temporality" (ibid, p. 425) than the notion of manoeuvring, as it accounts for both the present and for that which we aspire to or envision. Based on his research with young militia in Guinea-Bissau during the civil war of the late nineties, Vigh (2007) suggests that the notion of social navigation accounts not only for how people move within social environments or how these environments might dictate motion on people, but also for the complexity of how these motions interact. While the navigator on sea cannot decide to sail between two points on a map without taking the environment of the journey into account, and certainly cannot dictate

its characteristics in a strategic sense, the navigator still needs to tend to both the immediate and the distant in every consideration of how to act, continuously "evaluating the movement of the social environment, one's own possibilities for moving through it, and its effect on one's planned and actual movement" (ibid, p. 13). Vigh describes this as motion within motion, or motion squared.

That motion within motion is what I perceived in my encounter with Swedes Included. There are however at least two reasons for why I suggest carriership of intention instead of social navigation when considering my fieldwork. The first one is about an organisational particularity concerning the intention. The second is about what that notion could afford in terms of future research, so I'll leave that one to my conclusion.

The organisational particularity is, to use words originated in my encounter with Swedes Included, between the personal and professionalisation. The notion of carriership aims to instil a distance between the navigation and the intention, and thus attends to a central aspect of my fieldwork material, namely the possibility of *handing over* an intention. The navigation that Vigh describes is, as I understand it, not something that people or organisations can ask someone else to do for them. Although a strong link is often made in the social entrepreneurial domain between the founder and the organisation, the intention, transformed into organisational practices, however formal or informal, can still be handed over to someone or something else, even merged, abandoned, or replaced – as seen for example in Roya's and Olivia's attempts to prepare Swedes Included for a time less personal and without its founders. As such, the notion of carriership also instils another distance, namely that between the perceived or ascribed sense of ownership of the intention, and the individual or individuals of the organisation, be it founders, employees or others.

Thus, in addition to what a concept such as social navigation brings – and in addition to all the aspects of motion that I have explored throughout this thesis – the organisational particularities of the ownership, and the transferability of an intention, might also make carriership of intention a notion helpful to think with, in further exploring, for example, other domains of social change.

Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to add to a diverse and multifaceted understanding of what it might be to navigate, in particular, a domain of social entrepreneurship, and in general, a domain of social change. It departed from the overall question: what can we learn by following an organisation's practices of protecting, applying and advancing an intention for social change? And asked, more specifically: how is that intention navigated and negotiated in relation to partners and collaborators in the domain, how does it manifest itself in the everyday practices of the organisation, and how is it sustained in the encounter with uncertainty, indeterminacy and change?

Through my four analytical chapters I've coiled and knotted with these curiosities, hoping to convey a complex yet comprehensible tapestry of what organisational life might look like in a domain of social entrepreneurship. I have continuously both evaded and addressed that domain, hopefully conveying how I see it as essential to consider, but primarily as a demarcated space of power and will (de Certeau, 1984), an inversion (Ingold, 2011) of what more readily could be seen as a heterogeneous field (Tsing, 2012), where practices of protecting, applying and advancing an intention for social change are carried out in a variety of ways.

The proximal relational and experiential particularities that I've explored are there to think with also in a wider curiosity about organisational and social life. Based on my fieldwork material, I've hoped to convey not only an account of how it can be to navigate a *specific* domain, but also suggested the notion of *carriership of intention*, in an attempt to add to a specifically organisational understanding of what it might be to navigate a world of motion within motion (Vigh, 2007, 2009) with an aim for social change in mind.

The first analytical chapter explored the complexity of proximities and distances that were made as both Swedes Included and their partners tried to relate to how, and if, they should cling (Ingold, 2015) to one another. As such, the first chapter initiated the analytical contrasting of bounded and entwined sociality, of thinking about organisational life as happening between blobs or in an entanglement of lines (ibid). From the ambiguous proximity in the entanglement with the municipality of St. Remedy, to the frustrated distance in that with the municipality of Mount Gallow, Swedes Included's knottedness with the municipalities' circulatory system of decision making seemed decisive to how they could both offer and have access to the doors that afforded friendship. In the exploration of a

possible merger, the almost arterial proximity it seemed to indicate would have Swedes Included effect an inversion and delimit itself from the other organisation by the notion of the personal as a core.

The second analytical chapter set out to explore how that core, the notion of the personal, could be seen to be made in the everydayness of Swedes Included's work. Finding the personal to be thickly weaved into their administrative practices, my own participatory experience also suggested that rather than a core, the personal could be thought of as a centre of attention, and as such, a differentiator of those who had the threads with which to weave with that attention, from those who did not. Thus, a differentiation functioning as one might traditionally think about a boundary, as marking off elements which would seem to differ (Cohen, 1985), but here not based on a logic of insides and outsides, but on an understanding of threads as more or less tangled with knots of pertinent tension. A notion of belongingness or access, if you will, which also corresponds well with my own experiences of continuously threading trust, as described in the methods section of this thesis.

The third analytical chapter addressed the question of coherence, suggesting that from a perspective of knotted coherence the unmaking of an inversion, or a core, was not the same as the dissolution of an essence, and thereby not the end of an organisation as it had been known. In the encounter with uncertainty, indeterminacy and change, the intention could perhaps instead be seen to be sustained by a redistribution of attention. And although painful disentanglements might have to be made, such a redistribution of attention could also afford the possibility of new forms (Ingold, 2015), in a transformation where the organisation might perhaps still be seen to be of the same fabric.

The fourth analytical chapter, lastly, took a more conceptual and theoretical approach to exploring the dependencies and opportunities of tactically navigating a demarcated space of social entrepreneurship, in relation to ambitions and expectations of an increase in social impact and a capacity to scale. That chapter also ended with a suggestion of a different conceptualisation of Swedes Included as carriers of intention, based on their motion rather than on the denominations of a domain.

Thus, this has been a thesis about a non-profit organisation with an aim for social change, navigating a domain of social entrepreneurship. But rather than a thesis about social entrepreneurship or social entrepreneurs *per se*, it has been about *the practises and particularities of protecting, applying and advancing an intention for social change*. It has been an exploration and a contrasting of bounded and entwines sociality – of thinking with

boundaries (Simmel, 1994) and thinking with lines (Ingold, 2007, 2011, 2015), suggesting that the notion of entwined sociality allows for a far more complex and multifaceted understanding of social and organisational life.

Future Research

My curiosities for future research depart from the notion of carriership of intention, which I've presented in this thesis. One such curiosity links back to Tsing's (2012) account of scalability as a design feature which occults, as she has it, the wild diversity of life. Moving beyond notions of the winners and losers of the social entrepreneurial domain, the notion of carriership of intention might afford an exploration of what moves in the alleys and culverts of the demarcated spaces of social entrepreneurial agendas. Alluding to Tsing's (2015) engagement with Matsutake, the "wild mushrooms that live in human-disturbed forests" and are "willing to put up with some of the environmental messes humans have made" (ibid, p. 3f), the notion of carriership might afford an exploration of what intentions that dwell (Ingold, 2002) in such shadows and wastelands of scalable solutions aimed at building (ibid) a better world. Tsing (2015) claims to look for "*disturbance-based ecologies in which many species sometimes live together without either harmony or conquest*" (ibid, p. 5, italics in original). Are there such ecologies of social change?

On another note, as briefly mentioned before, Swedes Included's practices of protecting, applying and advancing their intention for social change could also be conceived of as practices of hope, with hope understood as a wish for something to come true by action (Swedberg, 2017; Genda, 2017), not aimed at something abstract but at something precise, with "a goal to which it points" (Swedberg, 2017, p. 44). With "a veritable explosion of writings on hope in the social sciences and the humanities" (Kleist & Jansen, 2016, p. 373) since the turn of the millennium, the notion of hope might afford a theoretically rich and well-grounded entry into the domain of social change, and the carriership of intention practiced there. Combined with a curiosity about non-scalability (Tsing, 2012), it might also counteract the risk of portraying emerging domains of social change, such as that of social entrepreneurship, as "the missing piece in the puzzle – the Holy Grail – which could put everything back on track again" (Berglund & Wigren, 2012, p. 10).

References

Affinity [Def. 2a, 2b (1)]. (n.d.). *Merriam-Webster Online.* In Merriam-Webster. Retrieved September 6, 2019, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/domain

Barinaga, E. (2013). Politicising Social Entrepreneurship – Three Social Entrepreneurial Rationalities Toward Social Change. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *4*(3), 347–372.

Berglund, K., & Skoglund, A. (2016). Social Entrepreneurship: To defend society from itself. In Riot, P. & Fayolle, A. (Eds.). *Rethinking Entrepreneurship*. Routledge

Berglund, K. and Wigren, C. (2012) Societal Entrepreneurship: The shaping of a different story of entrepreneurship. *Tamara Journal of Critical Organizational Inquiry*, *10*, 9–22.

Carr, E. S. (Ed.). (2016). *Scale: Discourse and dimensions of social life*. Univ of California Press.

Cohen, A. P. (1985). *Symbolic construction of community*. Routledge.

de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. University of California Press.

Dey, P., & Steyaert, C. (2016). Rethinking the Space of Ethics in Social Entrepreneurship: Power, Subjectivity, and Practices of Freedom. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *133*(4), 627–641.

Domain [Def. 4]. (n.d.). *Merriam-Webster Online.* In Merriam-Webster. Retrieved September 2, 2019, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/domain

Dudnik, N. (2010) 'Social Entrepreneurs' tricky Issues of Sustainability and Scale [online] *Harvard Business Review.* Available at: https://hbr.org/2010/10/social-entrepreneurs-tricky-is (Accessed: 31 Aug. 2019).

Dey, P., & Teasdale, S. (2016). The tactical mimicry of social enterprise strategies: Acting 'as if'in the everyday life of third sector organizations. *Organization*, *23*(4), 485-504.

Entangle (n.d.). *Merriam-Webster Online.* In Merriam-Webster. Retrieved September 2, 2019, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/domain

Entwine (n.d.). *Merriam-Webster Online.* In Merriam-Webster. Retrieved September 2, 2019, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/domain

Garsten, C., & Nyqvist, A. (2013). *Organisational anthropology: Doing ethnography in and among complex organisations*. Pluto Press.

Gatt, C., & Ingold, T. (2013). From description to correspondence: Anthropology in real time. *Design anthropology: Theory and practice*, 139-58.

Genda, Y. (2017). Hope and Society in Japan. In Miyazaki, H., & Swedberg, R. (Eds.). *The

Economy of Hope. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gibson, J. J. (2015). *The ecological approach to visual perception: classic edition.* Psychology Press.

Hannerz, U. (2006). Studying down, up, sideways, through, backwards, forwards, away and at home: Reflections on the field worries of an expansive discipline. In Coleman, S., & Collins, P. (Eds.). (2006). *Locating the field: space, place and context in anthropology.* Berg.

Houtbeckers, E. (2016). *Mundane social entrepreneurship - A practice perspective on the work of microentrepreneurs (Ph.D).* Aalto University.

Ingold, T. (2002). *The perception of the environment: essays on livelihood, dwelling and skill*. Routledge.

Ingold, T. (2007). *Lines: A brief history*. Routledge.

Ingold, T. (2011). *Being alive: Essays on movement, knowledge and description*. Routledge.

Ingold, T. (2014). That's enough about ethnography! *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, *4*(1), 383–395.

Ingold, T. (2015). *The life of lines*. Routledge.

Jackson, A. (ed.) (1987) *Anthropology at Home: ASA Monographs* 25. London: Tavistock.

Kleist, N., & Jansen, S. (2016). Introduction: Hope over Time—Crisis, Immobility and Future-Making. *History and Anthropology*, *27*(4), 373–392.

Krause-Jensen, J. (2013). Counter-espionage. Fieldwork among culture experts in Bang & Olufsen. In Garsten, C., & Nyqvist, A. (Eds.), *Organisational Anthropology: Doing Ethnography in and Among Complex Organisations.* (43-57). Pluto Books.

Lee, J., & Ingold, T. (2006). Fieldwork on foot: Perceiving, routing, socializing. In Coleman, S., & Collins, P. (Eds.). (2006). *Locating the field: space, place and context in anthropology*. Berg.

Madden, R. (2010). *Being Ethnographic: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Ethnography*. SAGE.

Mauksch, S., Dey, P., Rowe, M., & Teasdale, S. (2017). Ethnographies of social enterprise. *Social Enterprise Journal*, *13*(2), 114–127.

Nyqvist, A. (2013). Access to all stages?: studying through policy in a culture of accessibility. In Garsten, C., & Nyqvist, A. (Eds.), *Organisational Anthropology: Doing Ethnography in and Among Complex Organisations.* (pp. 72-88). Pluto Books.

O'Reilly, K. (2009). *Key concepts in ethnography*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd

Ortner, S. B. (2006). Anthropology and social theory: Culture, power, and the acting subject. Duke University Press.

Røyrvik, E. A. (2013). Oblique ethnography: Engaging collaborative complicity among globalised corporate managers. In Garsten, C., & Nyqvist, A. (Eds.), *Organisational Anthropology: Doing Ethnography in and Among Complex Organisations.* (pp. 72-88). Pluto Books.

Sandler, J., & Thedvall, R. (Eds.). (2017). *Meeting ethnography: Meetings as key technologies of contemporary governance, development, and resistance*. Taylor & Francis.

Sievers, S. M. M. (2016). Fragile heterotopias: a case study of a Danish social enterprise. *Community Development Journal*, 51(1), 77-94.

Simmel, G. (1994). Bridge and Door. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *11*(1), 5–10.

Swedberg, R. (2017). A Sociological Approach to Hope in the Economy. In Miyazaki, H., & Swedberg, R. (Eds.). *The Economy of Hope*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Thomas, H., Persson, R., Hafen, N. (2014). *"Social Enterprise, Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship in Sweden: A National Report"*. EFESEIIS. University of Southern Denmark.

Tsing, A. L. (2012). On NonscalabilityThe Living World Is Not Amenable to Precision-Nested Scales. *Common Knowledge*, *18*(3), 505-524.

Tsing, A. L. (2015). *The mushroom at the end of the world: On the possibility of life in capitalist ruins*. Princeton University Press.

Vigh, H. E. (2007). *Navigating terrains of war: Youth and soldiering in Guinea-Bissau*. Berghahn Books.

Vigh, H. (2009). Motion squared: A second look at the concept of social navigation. *Anthropological Theory*, *9*(4), 419-438.

Acknowledgements

Phew! The pages that precede this one could not had been written hadn't it been for a number of people whose help, support and inspiration has been decisive to getting the work done.

First of all, Roya and Olivia, I bow in appreciation and respect for your generosity and openness. I could not have felt more welcomed than I did tangling with you. Thank you everyone at Swedes Included! I hope that there is something for you to knot and weave on with in these pages.

Thank you Renita Thedvall for being patient with me in your supervision. I didn't always realise you were pointing me in the right directions, often I had walked a path for a while already when I realised that it actually was the one you had helped me see.

And along those winding roads, my dear dear friends and fellow anthropologists, Elin Linder, Virginia Lucadello and Emma Usher: without you = nada, niente, inte en chans. Your reading, commenting, suggesting, our discussions and elaborations … Invaluable.

A huge thank you Anette Nyqvist, for inspiring to creative writing, for taking time to discuss lofty ideas, and for helping me decide what field to approach, at a time when the haze seemed almost impenetrable.

A special thank you also the my fellow master students who allowed me help them with their theses, it taught me enormously and helped me see my own work better.

That's it, it's done.

Now what?